DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 469 713 CE 083 946

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | The Employer Perspective: A Survey of Employer Participation in Structured Workplace Learning, 2000. |
| INSTITUTION | AMR Interactive (Australia). |
| SPONS AGENCY | Australian Commonwealth Dept. of Education, Training and Youth Affairs, Canberra. |
| ISBN | ISBN-1-877041-01-7 |
| PUB DATE | 2001-10-00 |
| NOTE | 94p.; Prepared for and published by the Enterprise & Career Education Foundation Limited. |
| AVAILABLE FROM | For full text: http://www.ecef.com.au/web/km/ KMGateway.nsf/main_lookup/681C0A5A0 17A75DDCA256B01007E9098/ $FILE/TheEmployerPerspective.pdf. |
| PUB TYPE | Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160) |
| EDRS PRICE | EDRS Price MF01/PC04 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Adult Education; *Employer Attitudes; Foreign Countries; *Job Placement; National Surveys; On the Job Training; *Participation; Partnerships in Education; Postsecondary Education; Program Administration; Qualitative Research; Rural Urban Differences; Secondary Education; *Student Employment; Telephone Surveys; *Work Experience Programs |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Australia |

ABSTRACT

In 2000, a quantitative telephone survey of 2,098 businesses in Australia determined employer awareness of and participation in structured workplace learning (SWL) programs. It explored "drivers" of participation and employers' decision-making process. Comparisons with a 1998 survey identified changes in employer awareness, attitudes, and perceptions. Findings indicated 97 percent of employers believed SWL was a good idea; participation remained low at 5 percent; 60 percent of those rating SWL as a good idea would take students in the future; "selling" angles more likely to appeal more widely were increased staff satisfaction, improved recruitment, and community recognition; and activities that increased employer satisfaction included regular coordinator contact, appropriate match of students with employer, assisting employers in planning for student activities, and good preparation of students for the placement. The survey highlighted areas for improvement, including that capital cities had lower levels of awareness and acceptance of SWL than rural areas. Appendixes contain the questionnaire and these five papers: "Students Gain a Lot, But Also Give a Lot in the Workplace"; "Students in the Workplace Save Time--and Money"; "Employer Participation in Student Workplacements Goes On, and On...and On"; "Help Is at Hand All the Way for Students--and Employers"; and "Great Student Workplacements Throw Employer Concerns Out the Window." (YLB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 469 713

# The Employer Perspective

## A survey of employer participation in structured workplace learning 2000

*Prepared for the:*

Enterprise & Career
Education Foundation
(ECEF)

*Prepared By:*

**AMR** Interactive

October 2001

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Gilsenan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CE083946

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Published by the Enterprise and Career Education Foundation Limited

www.ecef.com.au

Level 9
76-80 Clarence Street
Sydney NSW 2000
ABN 48 095 711 649

Tel: (02) 9299 5899
Fax: (02) 9299 6766
Freecall: 1800 626 839
Email: info@ecef.com.au

ISBN 1-877041-01-7

© Commonwealth of Australia, August 2001
This work is Commonwealth copyright. It may be reproduced in whole or in part for study or training purposes, subject to the inclusion of an acknowledgment of the source and no commercial usage or sale. Reproduction for the purposes other than those indicated above requires the written permission of the Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs. Requests and enquiries concerning reproduction and copyright should be addressed to the Assistant Secretary, Industry Policy Branch, Enterprise and Career Education Branch, Schools, Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs, GPO Box 9880 CANBERRA CITY, ACT 2601.

The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the views of the Commonwealth Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs.

This product was funded by the Commonwealth Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs.

# Report Structure

This report is broadly divided into two sections.

**Section One – Table of Definitions, Executive Summary, Methodology, Key Findings**

Section One of the report (pages 6 to 22) comprises a table of definitions for specific words and phrases used in the context of this report, an executive summary and the methodology used for the survey.

Section One also includes a summary of key findings from the survey, which is categorised into Key Indicators, Sources of Awareness, Activities Influencing Participation, Attitudes to Benefits, Most Influential Benefits for Winning Participation, Attitudes to the Program by Industry Distinction, Levels of Participation, Experiences of Participants and Employer Concerns.

**Section Two – Survey Results**

Section Two of the report (pages 23 to 76) comprises the detailed results of the survey, including tables of main data and comments drawn from the data.

The full text of the questionnaire used for the survey can be found in Appendix A (page 77).

# CONTENTS

*Section One*

**TABLE OF DEFINITIONS** 6
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY** 7
**METHODOLOGY** 11
    Reasons for the Study 11
    Research Objectives 12
    Data Collection 12
    Sample Structure 12
    Recruitment of Respondents 14
    Reference Group 14
**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS** 15
    Key Indicators 15
    Sources of Awareness 16
    Activities Influencing Participation 17
    Attitudes to Benefits 18
    Most Influential Benefits for Winning Participation 18
    Attitudes to the Program by Industry Distinction 19
    Levels of Participation 19
    Experiences of Participants 20
    Employer Concerns 21
    In Conclusion 22

*Section Two*

**SURVEY RESULTS** 23
**Key Indicators** 24
    Measures Benchmarked in 1998 24
    Suggested Benchmark Measures 25
**Variations In Awareness & Participation** 29

Awareness & Participation by:

    Size 29
    Office Type 30
    Recruitment Difficulties 31
    Association Membership 32
    Population Centre Type 33
    State/Territory 34
    State/Territory By Year 35
    Industry 36
    Industry By Year 37
**Source of Awareness** 38
    Source of Awareness - Recent Participants 39
    Who Contacted Respondents to Participate in the Program 40
    "Word of Mouth" Impressions 41
**Information and Advice** 42
    Where Information Would be Sought If Considering Program 42
    Helpfulness of Advice Source - Recent Participants 43

**Consideration and Non Participation** **44**
- Consideration & Reasons for Non-Participation 44
- Reasons For Not Continuing 45

**Overall Attitude** **46**

Overall Attitude by:
- Size 46
- Population Centre Type 46
- State/Territory 47
- Office Type, Association Membership & Recruitment Difficulty 48
- Industry 49

**Program Benefits** **50**
- Specific Program Benefits Expected from Participation 50
- Expected Benefits by:
  - -Participation & Program Attitude 51
  - -Population Centre Type 52
  - -Number of Employees 53
  - -Industry 54
- Importance of Benefits: 55
  - -1998 vs 2000 56
  - -By Recent Participation & Overall Attitude to the Program 57
- How Benefits Achieved 58

**Attitudes** **60**
- For and Against the Program 60
- For and Against the Program By Overall Participation & Attitude 61

**Persuasiveness** **62**
- Of Strategies to Encourage Participation 62
- 1998 & 2000 63

**Program Participants** **64**
- Number of Students Taking Part in Past Twelve Months 64
- Active Involvement in the Program 65
- Contact with School or Coordinator 66
- Level of Student Preparation Prior to Placement 67
- Attitude to the Program By Participation In Past Year 68

**Satisfaction** **69**
- With the Program: Recent & Lapsed Participants 69
- With the Program & Intention to Participate 69
- By Selection Involvement & Activity Preparation 70
- By Quality of Contact With School or Coordinator 71
- By Preparation of the Students 72
- Influences on Satisfaction: A Summary 72

**Ways Program Could Be Improved** **73**

**Sample Characteristics** **74**
- Population Centre Type, State/Territory & Size 74

**Industry** **75**

**Job Titles of Respondents** **76**

**Heard of ASTF?** **76**

**APPENDIX A: THE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE** **77**

# SECTION ONE

## Table of Definitions

The following definitions are provided to clarify the meaning of specific words, phrases and acronyms used in the context of this report.

| | |
|---|---|
| *SWL* | Structured Workplace Learning |
| *The 'Program'* | Structured Workplace Learning programs funded by ECEF |
| *Participants* | Employers participating in the SWL programs |
| *Respondents* | Employers who were interviewed for this survey |
| *SILO* | Schools Industry Liaison Officer Project. School Industry Liaison Officers were appointed to provide a range of services and advice to employers on the values and benefits of SWL Programs. |

## Executive Summary

Employers play a fundamental role in ECEF's Structured Workplace Learning (SWL) Programs. Without their participation, SWL would simply not exist. In order to build on the progress of the Programs, continual evaluation is essential, and so in Nov/Dec 2000, AMR Interactive conducted a quantitative telephone survey of 2,098 businesses across Australia to:

- Determine the levels of employer awareness of and participation in SWL programs;
- Explore "drivers" of participation in SWL, and;
- Understand employers' decision making process.

Comparisons were made with a similar survey in 1998 to identify changes in employer awareness, attitudes and perceptions. The sample was stratified by state/territory, size of population centre, size of business and industry, and the results were weighted to estimates of the population distribution of all businesses on these variables.

The following key conclusions have been drawn from the findings of the survey:

### *Awareness and participation*

- The SWL Program concept is very well accepted. 97% believe it's a "good idea", while 42% accept the concept as suitable for their specific organisation.
- Actual participation in the past year remains low at 5%. Whilst this might be partly due to the low level of awareness (33%), the overall findings suggest other strategies for gaining participation would be more effective.
- Larger capital cities (that have the majority of students) have lower rates of awareness and acceptance of the Program, as well as lower levels of recent participation and loyalty.
- Few businesses appear likely to initiate participation. Also, when pressed, employers are predominantly unsure of whom they would contact other than the local school. Further evidence from the survey indicates that employers rely on being approached directly by schools or coordinators and that this is the key to winning participation.
- Continued contact with employers was found to be necessary for maintaining loyalty.

### *Easy Sell or Hard Sell?*

- The 42% who rated the Program a "good idea for my organisation" came to that view after a relatively brief description during the telephone survey, and before any specific benefits had been mentioned. This suggests employers quickly understand and support the Program making it a relatively 'easy sell' to many organisations, without the need to actually persuade them of the benefits.

- The 55% of organisations that decided the Program was "a good idea but not for them", also came to their decision quite quickly. For these businesses it is likely to be a relatively 'difficult sell' to persuade them to take part.

- 60% of those rating the Program as a good idea for them said they would be willing to take students in future. This equates to almost one quarter of all businesses and suggests that there appears to be no shortage of potential employers willing to take students.

- Comparisons with the 1998 survey showed that there had been no change in the proportion of businesses rating the Program a good idea for them. The views on the benefits of the Program were also similar to the 1998 survey.

***Motivators behind participation***

- When contacting organisations to seek participation, certain 'selling' angles are more likely to appeal more widely than others. Businesses readily accept that SWL would increase staff satisfaction, and participants have confirmed this as a major motivator.

- Other benefits may not be such strong motivators, although improved recruitment and community recognition are recognised by more than half of recent participants.

- Participants are less likely to see improvements to the bottom line as being important, and so this is not a major motivator. Not only might it be difficult to persuade managers that bottom line benefits can be achieved - it seems unnecessary to do so.

- Industry sectors have varied attitudes to and acceptance of the Program, indicating differing needs. Therefore both promotional activities and student preparations should reflect the particular characteristics of each industry.

- Organisations that have difficulty recruiting suitable staff were more likely to believe the Program is relevant for their organisation. They are more likely to rate the Program a good idea for their organisation (54% vs 40% that don't have recruitment difficulties), and were more positive about the Program generally. However, participation was similar (5% vs 6% that don't have recruitment difficulties).

- Testimonials from major employers in industries or local areas, and from industry associations can assist in confirming benefits. Student testimonials, particularly regarding productivity, cost savings or enhanced turnover are also beneficial.

- The real benefits of SWL experienced by participants is in line with the perceived benefits of those employers who had not yet participated, but thought SWL would be a good idea for them. This also confirmed that while some employers may have systemic reasons for why the Program is not suitable for them, the perceived concerns that others have toward taking students would not eventuate in reality.

- Where schools rely on students to make initial contact with employers, the students need to be well prepared, and the school or coordinator should follow up the initial contact. Relying solely on students to make contact without coordinator follow up is unlikely to achieve the service levels the employer expects, and therefore risk continued participation.

*Employer satisfaction*

- Activities that help to increase satisfaction include: regular contact by the coordinator, an appropriate match of students with the employer, assisting employers in their planning for the student's activities and ensuring good preparation of students for the placement.

- Direct employer involvement in selection of students seems less important in ensuring employer satisfaction. The findings indicate that employers are looking to the school coordinator to lead and support them in successfully managing the placements.

- 50% of participating employers would like to take more students, indicating that multiple student placements could be considered for many employers.

- About a quarter of participating employers would be prepared to contribute to the cost of students in some way.

- About one third of employers believe the student assessment process at the end of the placement is not good enough, and this rises to 40% of employers who recently participated in taking students.

- Although there was a highly positive attitude overall, a minority expressed some reservations, such as the Program being disruptive, or unable to supervise or train students. Finding a use for the students was a common reason for some not continuing.

*Next Steps*

The survey findings confirm strong support from employers for the Program. The results from the participants point to many worthwhile conclusions with major implications for the future conduct of SWL Programs, both in terms of the way they are promoted to employers and the level of service employers need to help make the Programs successful.

The findings also raise a number of issues which could not be settled with the limited sample obtained and within the structure of a larger survey brief. Thus, a separate survey of recent and lapsed participants, building on the findings obtained and using a questionnaire more focussed to participants only, would be of real value for further planning of the SWL Programs.

## Methodology

The following methodology outlines reasons for the study, research objectives defined, methods of data collection, the sample structure, recruitment of respondents, and the reference group involved in the survey. The full text of the survey questionnaire can be found in Appendix A.

***Reasons for the Study***

An initial survey was conducted in 1998 by AMR Interactive for the Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ACCI) and funded by ECEF (Enterprise and Career Education Foundation Limited). The survey had two broad aims; to obtain benchmark measures for the future evaluation of the Program and to assist in the development and implementation of the Schools Industry Liaison Officer Project (SILO). School Industry Liaison Officers were appointed to provide a range of services and advice to employers on the values and benefits of SWL Programs.

The survey in 2000 was carried out to identify changes to employer awareness, attitudes and perceptions against the 1998 benchmarks. Greater data was gained to identify and analyse any differences between various sectors such as size of business, industry sector, state or population centre type.

The 2000 survey was also used to gather information from current and lapsed participants about satisfaction from being involved in the Program and identifying drivers of satisfaction.

This period has seen the following activities:

- Substantial increases in the number of students involved in SWL Programs
- Shift in the focus of the Program (eg more towards larger businesses, and seeking to have businesses accept multiple students and to continue involvement in successive years)
- Increased promotional activities particularly by SILOs, managed by industry associations

The study was concerned solely with the SWL Programs sponsored through ECEF. The results cannot be taken as applicable to other workplace Program for students.

The study does not deal in any way with the demand from students for places.

### Research Objectives

The key objectives for the research were:

1. Compare the current situation on the Key Benchmark Indicators to the 1998 findings.
2. Identify characteristics associated with consideration of participation and actual participation, including how the business became aware of the Program, who they would turn to for advice and any advocacy experienced for or against the Program.
3. Test how employers would respond to different promotional Programs with regard to taking students on work placements.
4. For employers experienced in providing SWL, identify attitudes to how well students were prepared for and matched with their position, how well the employer was able to supervise the students, and whether they would employ the students when the students leave school.

### Data Collection

The primary methodology was to replicate the aspects of the 1998 survey that were relevant to the objectives for the year 2000 survey. This involved completion of 2000+ computer assisted telephone interviews with stratified samples of businesses. It was determined that telephone interviews, limited to 15 minutes on average (20 minute maximum), were the most effective way to obtain the data required.

### Sample Structure

The survey plan was to conduct at least two thousand interviews within the following strata.

1. *Size of business*

The number of interviews achieved in the 2000 survey for each of the target ranges by size of industry were as follows:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Micro | 2 to 5 employees | 755 |
| Small | 6 to 19 | 610 |
| Small Medium | 20 to 99 | 387 |
| Large Medium | 100 to 199 | 123 |
| Large | 200+ | 223 |

A more complete breakdown, with comparisons to the sample achieved in 1998, is shown on page 74.

The numbers achieved involved "over sampling" the small, medium and large categories to provide adequate base numbers for analysis. For total population estimates, the data was weighted to represent the distribution of numbers of employers, which is overwhelmingly in the micro and small strata.

2. *Industry type (using ANZSIC categories)*

A specified minimum number of interviews were to be conducted in 15 key industry categories. The data would be post-weighted to represent the broad population of businesses in Australia.

As interviewing progressed it proved necessary to revise some targets and to combine some categories (e.g., primary industry with mining; government, health services and community services). The actual distribution, comparing with 1998, are on page 75.

3. *Population centre type*

At least 200 interviews were obtained in the following stratums:

Capital City
Metropolitan (population 100,000+)
Urban (1000 to < 100,000)
Rural (<1000)

This required "over sampling" in the "Rural" stratum.

Again, the data was weighted to more closely represent the population. As data on number of businesses by population centre type was not available, the weighting targets were based on breakdowns of population numbers.

In the 1998 survey, 1507 businesses were in the stratified random sample, and a further 500 interviews were conducted with businesses known to have taken part in the Program. It was expected that, if the incidence of participation had increased from that found in 1998, and the 1998 result was valid, the sample would include at least 300 current or lapsed participants, defined as follows:

- "Lapsed participants" - took part but not in the current year.
- "Recent participants" - taking part this year.

Based on these estimates, it was decided not to obtain a separate sample of businesses that had participated in the Program.

The actual number of participants surveyed in 2000 was 216 - 159 recent, and 57 lapsed. The lower than expected number was due to an over-estimation of the participation rate by the 1998 survey, where it appears that many respondents claimed to be taking part when they were involved in work placement Programs other than SWL. This issue had been identified in the 1998 report. The proportion of participants surveyed was confirmed as representative by other work by ECEF, confirming the value of the change in question wording.

The results from the participants point to many worthwhile conclusions with major implications for the future conduct of the Program. They also raise a number of issues which could not be settled with the limited sample obtained and within the structure of a larger survey brief. Thus, a separate survey of recent and lapsed participants, building on the findings obtained and using a questionnaire more focussed to participants only, would be of real value for further planning of the SWL Programs.

### *Recruitment of Respondents*

As in the 1998 survey, suitable samples of telephone numbers were drawn, stratified by location, business size and type using CD-ROM directories of business telephone numbers.

Due to limited numbers of organisations having size recorded on the data base, an additional sample was purchased targeted by industry, location and size, for the small, small-medium, large-medium and large businesses. This was done after most interviewing in NSW and Victoria had been completed. As a result, the match of industry across states was not as close as would be desired.

The respondent to be interviewed was the the individual responsible for training and staff development at the location. If this responsibility lay at another location (eg the location contacted was a small branch or outlet of a larger organisation) referral to the responsible individual in a larger office was sought.

In 1998, businesses were informed that the survey was being conducted on behalf of the Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry (the primary client for that survey). This may have improved the response rate compared to not indicating the sponsor of the survey.

One objective was to establish awareness of ECEF, so the 2000 survey was introduced to the respondent as being conducted by "AMR Interactive, a market research firm calling on behalf of a national organisation involved in placing school students with employers. We are conducting research into recruitment and training on behalf of employers and industry."

At the end of the survey respondents were asked if they would agree to having their details passed on to ECEF and to receive an ECEF Newsletter. All respondents agreed.

### *Reference Group*

A Reference Group assisted ECEF by contributing their input and advice to the study, particularly with regard to the development of the questionnaire, the sample mix (size of business, industry type, population centre type), initial presentation of the findings and the finished report. The Reference Group comprised:

Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, ACCI (Mary Nicolson)
Group Training Australia, GTA (Jeff Priday)
Australian Industry Group, AiG (Brian Kerwood)
Salmat Plc Ltd (Alex Simmons)
TATE Associates Plc Ltd (Danny Porter)

Particular thanks goes to these organisations, and to each person involved, for giving their time and making such a helpful contribution.

## Summary of findings

The key findings from the survey have been categorised into:

- Key indicators
- Sources of awareness
- Activities influencing participation
- Attitudes to benefits
- Most influential benefits for winning participation
- Attitudes to the program by industry distinction
- Levels of participation
- Experiences of participants
- Employer concerns
- In conclusion

### *Key Indicators*

- The survey found that 5% of businesses had participated in the Program during the past 12 months, with 9% having ever participated, and 33% being aware of the Program. The participation rate closely matched that calculated by comparing a census of participants with the estimated number of businesses with at least two employees in Australia.

- Awareness and participation rates were well below those found in the similar survey conducted by AMR Interactive in 1998. This was probably due to a much more precise description of the SWL Program in the relevant questions. The latest results appear more valid.

- Very few respondents (3%) considered the Program to be "not a good idea". 55% of the sample rated it as a good idea but not suitable for their own organisation. This has remained very stable since 1998.

- A majority (59%) of those rating the Program as a "good idea for our organisation" agreed they would be willing to take students in future.

  If these rates are applied to the estimated number of businesses with at least two personnel in Australia, the potential market can be estimated as:

| | |
|---|---|
| Total number of businesses (with 2 or more employees) (source ABS 1321.0) | 723,800 |
| 42% saying 'good idea for us' | 304,000 |
| 59% of those saying 'good idea for us' who would like to take students | 180,000 |

- Most (80%) of those aware of the Program, and nearly all (93%) of those currently taking part were willing to recommend the Program to others. Among those aware, 12% had already done so, while 26% of current year participants had already done so.

- Participants were also likely to continue next year (with 67% saying they would, and 11% unsure, while 22% said they would not). Reasons for not continuing related more to internal considerations within the organisation, or to lack of active contact by a school or coordinator, than to actually taking students or problems with the Program's implementation.

***Sources of Awareness***

- There was considerable variety in the sources of initial awareness. The most common sources of awareness were students (22%), and a school (21%). Much smaller numbers mentioned media (8%), newspapers (4%), or radio (3%) - a total of 15%. Word of mouth (4%) and having children who had taken part (4%) were followed by a variety of other sources (each 1-3%). Industry associations were a minor element in the sources of initial awareness (2%). Local coordinators were also rarely identified as the initial source (1%), probably because they were seen to represent the school.

- Recent participants were more likely to have initially learned of the Program from the school (27%), with the numbers by students (23%) remaining the same. Awareness from some industry associations and ECEF activities (4% vs 1%) also increased for recent participants. Few participants had gained awareness from any of the media sources (1% of participants vs 15% of all aware) suggesting that awareness in itself does not lead to participation.

- The high level of awareness of all employers by students, and awareness of recent participants, indicate the importance schools give to encouraging students to make the initial contact about a possible placement.

- Most of those who were aware had not been contacted by anyone about the Program (67%) or could not recall if they had (8%). In contrast most of those recently taking part had been actively approached (73%) and this had been the reason why they participated.

- "Word of mouth" was not a major influence. Three in four of those aware had not heard anything about the Program from others, with a similar ratio for recent participants. Some had heard both favourable and unfavourable information about the Program, so replies total to more than 100%. Of those who had heard something most reported it to be favourable, although recent participants had also heard more unfavourable comments. (20% favourable and 9% not, versus 19% favourable and 4% not for 'all aware'). Any unfavourable comments do not seem to have deterred participation.

- When asked where they would seek (non-participants) or had sought information (recent participants): 60% of participants said they did not seek advice; 34% of non-participants were unsure who to contact and 6% said they would not seek advice. The most common source of information was from a school (29% non- and 24% participants). Where contacts had been made, most sources were considered helpful.

### *Activities Influencing Participation*

- The main conclusion from the survey is that businesses rarely seek information about the Program, and when asked are unclear on where such information can best be obtained.

*Positive Influences*

- Opinions about what would persuade employers to take part emphasised personal approaches by schools or local coordinators and personal recommendation by someone within their own industry. Also potentially influential with around one third of the respondents were student testimonials, the offer of publicity by local schools for participation, endorsement by a large employer in their industry or their industry association, and the offer of training for their staff.

- Suggestion or direction from senior management appeared less influential, but this was largely because of the number of respondents who stated this was not applicable (45%), perhaps because they did not have anyone senior to them.

- Employers who were more positive about the Program's relevance were from larger organisations (200 or more employees), those in country cities (Urban) or small towns (Rural), and those in some industries. Organisations in the larger cities are less willing to acknowledge relevance of the Program.

*Negative Influences*

- Those who were aware but had not taken part in the Program revealed some barriers to participation when asked if they had considered taking part, and if so, their reason for not doing so. Most had simply never considered participation (86%). Thus, either there are barriers to initial consideration, or insufficient motivation to take the initiative against the inertia of "business as usual". Direct contact with the business might overcome this.

- The 14% aware of the Program, who considered participation but did not go ahead gave such reasons as insufficient benefit (14%), being too busy or not getting around to it (total 24%), lacking someone to manage the student(s) (7%), concern that participation would be disruptive (6%) or not knowing who to contact (3%). Some (7%) said they were in the process of organising participation. A few reported negative experiences with the school representative or local coordinator (7%).

- The importance of an active outreach is further supported by the 54 respondents who had taken part in the Program previously, but did not in the past year. One third (34%) said it was because no-one had contacted them, 38% that they did not need a student this year, or would not be able to use one due to internal circumstances, and the rest gave similar reasons to those who had considered participation and not gone ahead.

- Only 4% cited difficulties with the school or coordinator, and only 7% cited lack of suitable students. Thus, it appears that participants have no real problem with the suitability of students or with the Program administration by schools and coordinators. Factors internal to the business appear to be the main causes of ceasing participation.

### *Attitudes to Benefits*

- Generally respondents expected the SWL Program to deliver some benefits rather than alot of benefits. The expected benefits concentrated on staff satisfaction (expected by 56%), community recognition (50%) and more effective and efficient recruitment (46%).

- Personal satisfaction of staff and effective recruitment were considered the two most important benefits for an employer taking part in the Program, which match the benefits expected. Expectations for increased productivity (35%) and enhanced skill base (34%) were low although considered important. Expectations for improved bottom line (22%) were lowest and also considered least important as a benefit from the Program.

- Recognition of the benefits was quite polarised between employers who believe the Program is a good idea for them and those who think it is a good idea, but not suitable for them. Those thinking the Program is a good idea for them recognise each benefit by a factor of 50% to 100% more than those who think the Program is not for them.

- All ratings of the benefits were slightly lower than the results obtained in 1998, but were in the same order. The largest fall was for more efficient and effective recruitment (down from 53% to 46%).

- Benefits such as improved recruitment and community recognition do have an impact on gains in productivity and the bottom line. It appears many respondents either do not recognise the impact on productivity or on the bottom line or believe that the links are insufficient to achieve notable gains. It would appear to be both difficult and unnecessary to try to convince managers that bottom line gains should be expected from the Program.

- Expectation of specific benefits varied by the population centre type (more benefits endorsed by those in smaller cities and rural towns) and businesses size (those employing at least 100 people).

- A high acceptance of the Program was confirmed by other key indicators, as detailed below.

### *Most Influential Benefits for Winning Participation*

- Staff satisfaction, the benefit that was most widely rated as important by all businesses (66%) was also the most expected from participants (56%).

- Community recognition - the second most likely to be expected (50%) - was the **least** likely to be rated as important (47%).

- Improvements to bottom line was the least expected benefit (22%) and considered to be important as a deliverable by less than half of organisations (47%). When all respondents were asked how participation could improve the bottom line, 62% stated it would not.

- Those who took part in the Program in the past year, compared to the total sample, placed greater emphasis on the importance of staff satisfaction (86%) and benefits for recruitment (65%), and less on the importance of benefits for the bottom line.

This suggests that, for those taking part so far, staff satisfaction and improved recruitment were strong motivations, while benefits for the bottom line were not.

- It also suggests that winning participation does not require that bottom line benefits be demonstrated. Nor was the importance of community recognition associated with participation. Benefits for the organisation in terms of staff satisfaction and improved recruitment efficiency appear to be sufficient to persuade many to participate.

### *Attitudes to the Program by Industry Distinction*

- The industry areas that were more positive about the relevance of the Program were Hospitality and Tourism, Utilities and Communications, (which both had a higher participation rate, 9% and 13% respectively), Retail, and the combination of Government, Education, Health and Community Services (which both had slightly lower than average participation rates of 3% and 2% respectively).

- While Retail organisations were the most positive about the Program, they had the lowest loyalty rate. Perhaps experience with the Program in the Retail sectors has not confirmed the positive expectations.

- Finance & Insurance and Building & Construction were the least positive about the relevance of the Program for their organisation. While participation by the Building & Construction industry was average (5%), conversion was the lowest. Participation was very low in the Finance & Insurance industry (1%).

- Acceptance of the relevance of the Program was similar for both members and non-members of an industry association. This suggests that promotional activities of industry associations have not specifically influenced the attitudes of their members.

- Expectation of specific benefits also varied by Industry (Utilities and Communications, Hospitality and Tourism, and Retail industries were more positive, while Business Services, Transport, Finance and Insurance and Construction were less likely to endorse the benefits).

### *Levels of Participation*

- A majority of those who considered the Program a "good idea for us" (59%) said they would be willing to take one or more students next year. Even 18% of businesses that said the Program was a good idea but not for them said they would like to take students. Thus, there is clear potential to engage businesses by simply introducing the Program, checking whether they then consider it a good idea for them, and then concentrating on those who indicate willingness to consider taking a student.

- Also, half (50%) of current participants indicate they would like to take more students in the Program. There is great potential to increase the efficiency of the coordinator activities by increasing the number of students per employer.

- Only 15% of all respondents agreed they would be willing to bear some of the cost, and 66% disagreed. More of those who took part (23%), and of those who considered the Program good for them (26%) accepted bearing some of the cost.

Thus, any **requirement** to share costs could reduce participation or limit potential for growth; some, however, might be willing to contribute if requested.

### *Experiences of Participants*

#### *Employer satisfaction*

- Those who took students on structured work placements experienced the benefits to a greater extent than the expectations of the total sample expected. Staff satisfaction (12 points higher), increased productivity and improved recruitment (both 9 points higher) stood out as the main benefits more often acknowledged by participants.

- 84% of participants were satisfied with the Program, including 34% very satisfied, and only 5% dissatisfied.

- This was reflected in a high level of willingness to take part in future, with 78% saying either they would (67%) or might (11%) do so. Of the 22% who indicated they would not, mostly cited reasons internal to the company, rather than problems with the Program or its execution. However, those who were very satisfied were more likely to intend to continue taking students than those who were moderately satisfied. Thus, ensuring a highly satisfying experience is a key to high loyalty.

- Analysis of the relationship of various items to satisfaction suggested that employers planning student activities in advance, contact being maintained by the school or coordinator, and ensuring that students are well prepared are the keys to high employer satisfaction. Specifically, satisfaction was high for:

    - 32% of those where employers prepared student activities in advance, compared to 16% of those where student activities were not planned;

    - 38% of those where contact with the coordinator went well, compared to 18% of those who felt contact went "quite well", and almost none (about 3%) of those where it went not so well or did not occur; and

    - 51% of those who considered all student very well prepared compared to 27% of those who considered the student(s) "mostly well prepared", and only 13-15 % of those who considered student preparation just adequate or to be insufficient.

- Most participants (82%) considered the Program a good idea for their organisation, much higher than for the total sample (42%). As the Program was considered a good idea by almost all the sample (97%), matching the relevance and suitability to the organisation is a major issue for winning greater participation.

- Participants, who were less than very satisfied, were asked how the Program could be improved. One in four (27%) either said they did not know or that there was no improvement needed or that the Program was good "as it is".

- Overall employer involvement in selection of students was not related to satisfaction with the Program or willingness to take part in future.

### *Employer contact*

- The first contact to invite participation for most participants (as opposed to create awareness) was by the school (52%) or the local coordinator (13%) rather than by a student (7%),
- Most (84%) considered that the contacts overall went either quite well (44%) or very well (40%), with only 16% reporting contacts did not go well or were not made (about equal). As noted above, the quality of contact directly affects the employer satisfaction with participation, which in turn affects willingness to continue taking part.
- While sending the students to make initial contact with employers can provide a personal development experience for the student, it is clear that formal invitation to participate should be followed up by the school or coordinator. Reliance on the student to make the contact, without appropriate follow up, is likely to reduce the level of planning and preparation by both the employer and student, and reduce opportunities for selling the benefits.
- If students make the initial contact, they need to be well trained, and prepared, so that they can clearly explain the Program, and match the benefits that most motivate that employer. As the survey found only 7% of invitations to participate were by students it would appear that students are not being tasked with these demanding challenges.

### *Areas for Improvement*

- Employers consider improvements to student preparation are needed. When asked to rate this, while 21% said all, and 23% said most students were well prepared (44% in all), 31% said preparation by students was just adequate, and 13% that it had not been good enough. Student preparation was also related to employer satisfaction and intention to continue participation.
- Other suggestions for improvements covered better planning, follow up or coordination by the coordinator, more preparation of students about what is involved in working at an organisation, and better matching of students, either in terms of skills, personal suitability or motivation. These are consistent with the various items related to satisfaction with the Program.
- A few participants (13%) said that their organisation was not suitable for training of students or was limited in what it could teach.

### ***Employer Concerns***

- Employers expressed some concerns that coordinators and schools should consider. In particular:
  - About half expected that participation would take too much staff time (52%) and;
  - Over one quarter considered that they would not get the type of students they needed (29%).

  In both cases the experience of recent participants indicate that these perceived concerns are less significant in practice (37% and 17% respectively).

- Employers are concerned about the benefits for the students from the Program as 37% of current participants considered that the assessment process at the end of the placement is not good - and a further 29% were not sure either way.

- The concern that students would take too much staff time was much higher among those seeing the Program as a good idea but not for them (over 60%) than for those who thought the Program a good idea for their organisation (39%). Recent participants had a similar rate (37%) as the expectations of those who thought the Program was a good idea for them.

### *In Conclusion*

- The size of the sample of recent participants potentially limits the findings. A larger survey specifically with recent participants and lapsed participants would provide greater confidence in the findings of this survey. Additionally, operational issues raised in this survey could be investigated in greater detail such as differences in States, industries, size of business. This would build on the findings of the survey, and could include more areas that were not covered in the 1998 survey (which used the same questionnaire for 500 participating organisations as the randomly selected sample of 1,500).

- Overall, it appears that active and highly satisfactory contact with the school or coordinator, preparation of the students, and planning of activities in advance not only avoid dissatisfaction, but boost the proportion who were very satisfied. This in turn boosts the numbers who intend repeat involvement next year. Even many lapsed participants would return to take students if quality procedures were in place. Employer involvement in the selection of students appears less likely to repay the effort required to organise it.

# SECTION TWO

## Survey Results

The detailed results of the survey are shown in the following pages.

The tables include the main data collected from the survey. In addition the comments draw on the full range of data collected and included in the working papers.

At the time of the survey the Enterprise & Career Education Foundation (ECEF) was still called the Australian Student Traineeship Foundation (ASTF) and so the results continue to refer to the ASTF (as does the Questionnaire in Appendix A).

All data has been weighted by State/Territory, size of business, type of population centre and industry, to better represent the total population of businesses in Australia.

The source for the weighting targets was data published by the ABS on the relevant variable.

ABS information was not available to determine targets for number of businesses by type of population centre (basically, the size of the town or city). Instead a breakdown of the percentage of the population aged 15 or over living in centres of each size was used as a proxy for a breakdown of businesses.

## *Key Indicators*

### *Measures Benchmarked in 1998*

The 1998 survey identified a number of "benchmarks" which should be used to track the performance of the Program in subsequent surveys. Results for these measures are shown in the table below, with comparisons between the 1998 and 2000 surveys. Results for those in 2000 who had taken part in the Program in the past year are also shown.

Table 1: Key Indicators Benchmarked in 1998

| | 1998 | Year 2000 | Took Part In Past Year |
|---|---|---|---|
| RESPONDENTS | 1507 | 2098 | 159 |
| | % | % | % |
| Aware of Structured Workplace Programs | 47 | 33 | 100 |
| Participated in past 12 months | 9 | 5 | 100 |
| Believe the Program delivers at least some benefit in the areas of: | | | |
| Personal Satisfaction for Staff | 60 | 56 | 78 |
| Community Recognition | 55 | 50 | 55 |
| More Efficient & Effective Recruitment | 53 | 46 | 55 |
| Increasing Productivity | 38 | 35 | 44 |
| Enhance Skills Base | 33 | 34 | 37 |
| Improve Bottom Line | 25 | 22 | 25 |

- The rates of awareness and participation appear to have dropped considerably. However, the participation rate found by the survey for 2000 was very similar to the rate calculated by ECEF, using the number of organisations known to be taking students, and dividing by a "best estimate" of the number of businesses with at least 2 employees.

- The reason for the apparent drop over a period when actual participation has been rising, is that the 2000 survey defined Structured Workplace Learning more precisely than had been done in the 1998 survey. This was because, following the previous survey, ECEF had found that many businesses were counting students undertaking other types of work placement when completing returns. Thus the questions defining SWL placements were refined for this survey, resulting in a more valid estimate of the incidence of companies taking part, and, it seems reasonable to conclude, of awareness of the specific Program.

- In both surveys, the softer benefits were more widely endorsed, while the "harder" benefits for productivity and the bottom line were less often endorsed.

- Participants in the past year were more likely than the total sample to endorse staff satisfaction (12 points higher), increased productivity and improved recruitment (both 9 points higher).

*Suggested Benchmark Measures*

A number of other measures introduced in the 2000 survey would be useful as key indicators in future surveys, with the 2000 survey providing the benchmark data. Results for these are reported here.

Table 2: Overall Attitude to the Program

| Q5a OVERALL ATTITUDE TO PROGRAM | 1998 | Year 2000 |
|---|---|---|
| | | Total |
| RESPONDENTS | 1507 | 2098 |
| | % | % |
| A good idea, for your organisation | 42 | 42 |
| A good idea, but not for your organisation | 54 | 55 |
| Not a good idea at all | 4 | 3 |

- Overall acceptance of the Program, and recognition of its relevance for the respondent's own business would also be useful benchmark measures.

- There was almost no change in 2000 from the very positive overall attitude to the Program found in 1998, with 97% in 2000 and 96% in 1998 saying the Program was a good idea.

- There was also no change in the 42% who considered the Program a good idea for their own organisation. Thus, attitude to participation, at least in principle, has remained fairly positive, although still less than half of those who are positive overall indicate that they see the Program a good idea for their own organisation.

- It appears that nothing has happened in the period since 1998 to enhance attitudes to taking part, and nothing has happened to undermine the positive overall view.

- Further, the result suggests that a high level of interest in Program involvement can be established given a quite brief description of the Program, as these results were obtained before any specific Program benefits had been described. This has major implications for how best to market the Program. Relatively brief telephone calls to the right decision maker might be sufficient to obtain a substantial increase in Program uptake.

Table 3: Participants Willingness to Continue Taking Students

| | Year 2000 |
|---|---|
| RESPONDENTS<br>*(recent participants)* | 126<br>% |
| Continue to take Students - Yes | 71 |
| Continue to take Students - Maybe | 8 |
| Will not continue to take students | 20 |
| RESPONDENTS<br>*(will not continue to take students)* | 24 |
| Reasons will not continue to take students | % |
| Changed circumstances - unable to supervise/use properly, etc | 29 |
| Was not able to use student properly/waste of time | 13 |
| Bad experience this year | 18 |
| Management decision, rationale not known | 16 |
| Other reasons given | 13 |

- A question not asked in 1998 that could also be a useful performance indicator - replies of participants when asked whether they will take students in future.

- Replies in 2000 indicate that 71% were definite that they would do so, with 8% unsure, and only 20% saying they would not.

- When asked their reasons for not taking students next year, most (68%) gave reasons that were more related to their internal processes than suggesting the Program was poorly run.

- Despite this, the question could be a useful indicator, as those placing students should be working with organisations to overcome such problems, even if the problem is primarily internal to the organisation where the student is placed.

- 18% of the 24, who said they would not take students next year, indicated this was due to a bad experience with the Program this year. Although based on a small sample, and indicating that this is a relatively minor reason for dropping out, there could still be value in coordinators consistently seeking feedback as a basis for improving student selection and Program management.

Table 4: Whether would recommend participation to others

| Q5d WHETHER RECOMMEND PARTICIPATION TO OTHERS | Those Aware | Took Part Past Year |
|---|---|---|
| RESPONDENTS | 744 | 159 |
| | % | % |
| Yes - have already done so | 12 | 26 |
| Yes - willing to do so | 68 | 67 |
| Would not do so | 4 | 1 |
| Unsure/it depends | 16 | 5 |

- Whether those aware of the Program, and especially whether participants would or already have recommended participation to others, is also an important performance indicator that could be tracked in future surveys.

- Performance on this item was very positive, with 80% of those aware and 93% of recent participants indicating they either already had recommended participation to others (12% and 26%) or were willing to do so (68% and 67%), and only 4% (1% of participants) saying they would not recommend participation.

- The replies by participants further confirm that "dropping out" of the Program is more due to internal difficulties or changes than to rejection of the Program, as so few would not recommend participation.

- The results for this item clearly indicate that businesses are very open to the Program concept. While some businesses will not be willing to take part, approaches seeking participation will not generally meet objections.

- Thus, increasing awareness from the current level of 33% could assist expansion of the Program by establishing a larger pool of organisations that would be open to participation. However, given that participants were generally approached by the school, coordinator or student, and very few took the initiative themselves, enhancing awareness levels will not in itself increase participation. Active contact to recruit participants appears to be necessary.

Table 5: Conversion & Loyalty

| Q2a/b/c Awareness and Participation | 1998 | Year 2000 | Year 2000 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Total | Ever Took Part |
| RESPONDENTS | 1507 | 2098 | 216 |
| | % | % | % |
| TOTAL AWARE | 47 | 33 | 100 |
| TOTAL EVER TOOK PART | 12 | 9 | 100 |
| Took part in last year | 9 | 5 | 59 |
| Aware, never took part | na | 24 | 0 |
| Aware - no extra prompting | na | 23 | 23 |
| Aware - after extra prompting | na | 10 | 10 |
| TOTAL NOT AWARE | 53 | 67 | 0 |
| Conversion Rate:<br>(Taken Part Past Year/Aware) | 19% | 15% | na |
| Loyalty Rate:<br>(Taken Part Past Year/ Ever Took Part) | na | na | 59% |

- Another useful benchmark measure would be the conversion ratio - those who have taken part in the Program in the past year as a percentage of those aware of the Program.

- The conversion rate (percent of those aware who had taken part) was similar (19% in 1998, 15% in 2000). Any difference could be due to the change in how awareness and participation were established.

- Loyalty would be another useful benchmark measure. This is the percentage of those who have ever taken part in the past year. As shown above, this was 59% for those included in the 2000 survey. Clearly, improved loyalty could greatly assist both penetration and the total number of students placed. It could also reduce the costs of placing students, as acquiring a new participant is likely to be more expensive than dealing with any doubts about continued participation.

### *Variations In Awareness and Participation*

One purpose of the survey was to understand how awareness and participation vary by such key characteristics of organisations as size, location and industry.

In this section, the variations are analysed and some conclusions drawn about the characteristics of organisations which are more or less accepting of the Program.

*Awareness and Participation By Size*

Table 6: Awareness and Participation by Number of Employees

| Q2a/b/c Awareness and Participation | Year 2000 | EMPLOYEES IN AUSTRALIA | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | 2 to 5 | 6 to 19 | 20 to 99 | 100-199 | 200+ |
| RESPONDENTS | 2098 | 755 | 610 | 387 | 123 | 223 |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| TOTAL AWARE | 33 | 32 | 36 | 31 | 29 | 34 |
| TOTAL EVER TOOK PART | 9 | 7 | 13 | 8 | 5 | 13 |
| Took part in last year | 5 | ***4*** | 7 | 7 | 5 | **9** |
| Aware, never took part | 24 | 24 | 24 | 23 | 24 | 22 |
| Aware - no extra prompting | 23 | 21 | 25 | 21 | 15 | 26 |
| Aware - after extra prompting | 10 | 10 | 11 | 10 | 14 | 9 |
| TOTAL NOT AWARE | 67 | 68 | 64 | 69 | 71 | 66 |
| Conversion Rate (Taken Part Past Year/Aware) | 16% | ***14%*** | 19% | **24%** | 16% | **28%** |
| Loyalty Rate (Taken Part Past Year/Ever Taken Part) | 59% | 58% | 56% | **89%** | **96%** | **75%** |

- Awareness did not vary greatly by size of business.
- Participation in the past year rose from 4% among the smallest businesses to 9% among the largest.
- Conversion rates tended to be higher among larger businesses, although those with 100-199 employees broke the pattern.

### *Awareness and Participation By Office Type*

Table 7: Awareness and Participation By Office Type

| Q2a/b/c Awareness and Participation | Year 2000 | Head Office | Branch Office | Sole Site |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| RESPONDENTS | 2098 | 374 | 258 | 1385 |
|  | % | % | % | % |
| TOTAL AWARE | 33 | 35 | 31 | 33 |
| TOTAL EVER TOOK PART | 9 | 12 | 6 | 9 |
| Took part in last year | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Aware, never took part | 24 | 23 | 25 | 24 |
| Aware - no extra prompting | 23 | 14 | 22 | 23 |
| Aware - after extra prompting | 10 | 10 | 9 | 11 |
| TOTAL NOT AWARE | 67 | 65 | 69 | 67 |
| Conversion Rate: (Taken Part Past Year/Aware) | 16% | 15% | 17% | 16% |
| Loyalty Rate: (Taken Part Past Year/ Ever Taken Part) | 59% | 44% | 95% | 60% |

- The Office Type had little effect on awareness, or whether participated in the past year, and so had little effect on the conversion rate.

- However, there was a marked difference in loyalty, with the small group of Branch Offices that had ever participated (n=18) being most likely to be participating in the past year. However, given the small base and the possible impact of weighting within small samples, this result must be considered as, at best, suggestive.

- As can be seen later, the even smaller group of branch offices participating in the past year was least likely to expect to take part next year. Given this marked disparity between past loyalty and future intentions, targeted research with larger samples of recent and lapsed participants would be needed to clarify this issue.

*Awareness and Participation By Recruitment Difficulties*

Table 8: Awareness and Participation By Whether Experiencing Recruitment Difficulties

| Q2a/b/c Awareness and Participation | Total Sample | Recruitment Difficulties | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Yes | No | Unsure |
| RESPONDENTS | 2098 | 589 | 1387 | 122 |
| | % | % | % | % |
| TOTAL AWARE | 33 | 34 | 36 | 3 |
| TOTAL EVER TOOK PART | 9 | 6 | 11 | <1 |
| Took part in last year | 5 | 5 | 6 | <1 |
| Aware, never took part | 24 | 28 | 25 | 3 |
| Aware - no extra prompting | 23 | 22 | 26 | 2 |
| Aware - after extra prompting | 10 | 12 | 11 | 1 |
| TOTAL NOT AWARE | 67 | 66 | 64 | 97 |
| Conversion Rate:<br>(Taken Part Past Year/Aware) | 16% | 14% | 17% | 4% |
| Loyalty Rate:<br>(Taken Part Past Year/Ever Taken Part) | 59% | 76% | 55% | * |

* Base too small for meaningful calculation

- It was anticipated that those with recruitment difficulties (25% of the sample) would be more open to participation in the Program.

- Those who were clear that they did or did not have recruitment difficulties did not differ in awareness. Those who were not sure were largely unaware, partly because most said they were not sure whether they were aware or not

- Actual participation in the past year was almost the same, with those not having recruitment difficulties slightly higher (6% vs 5%).

- There was no significant difference in the conversion rates, although again, those not having recruitment difficulties had a slightly higher conversion rate (17% vs 14%).

- Those without recruitment difficulties were more likely to have ever taken part, thus the loyalty rate was lower. It could be that having recruitment difficulties results in a more positive response to participation and thus in greater loyalty. However, with only 58 respondents both having had recruitment difficulties and having ever taken part, and 156 not having recruitment difficulties who had ever taken part, the difference could be a statistical accident.

- Thus, while it is clearly possible to make a case for the Program as making a contribution to overcoming recruitment difficulties, the evidence suggests that organisations that have such difficulties have not actually had a higher level of participation.

*Awareness and Participation By Association Membership*

Table 9: Awareness and Participation By Industry Association Membership

| Q2a/b/c Awareness and Participation | Total Sample | Industry Association Membership | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Yes | No |
| RESPONDENTS | 2098 | 1277 | 695 |
| | % | % | % |
| TOTAL AWARE | 33 | 36 | 29 |
| TOTAL EVER TOOK PART | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| Took part in last year | 5 | 6 | 3 |
| Aware, never took part | 24 | 27 | 20 |
| TOTAL NOT AWARE | 67 | 64 | 71 |
| Conversion Rate: (Taken Part Past Year/Aware) | 16% | 17% | 11% |
| Loyalty Rate: (Taken Part Past Year/Ever Taken Part) | 59% | 70% | 37% |

- Industry Association members (67% of the sample) were somewhat more likely to be aware of the Program, and twice as likely (6% vs 3%) to have taken part in the past year.

- Consequently, the conversion rate (17% vs 11%) and loyalty rate (70% vs 37%) were higher for Industry Association members.

- This might reflect the support for the Program from some Industry Associations.

- However Industry Associations were rarely nominated as sources of advice that would be used, if considering participation (for those not taking part - 3%), or had been used (for those taking part, 1%) and were rarely mentioned as sources of awareness of the Program.

- It might be that industry association members are more likely to receive information about the Program, or that schools and coordinators are concentrating on members in their local areas for promoting the Program - and perhaps have done so at a higher level in the past year.

- Alternatively, members may be responding to support for the Programs by their associations. It could also be that organisations that join industry associations are more open to participation across a range of areas, including SWL Programs.

- As will be seen later, there was no relationship between membership of an Industry Association and overall attitude to the Program, or its relevance for the respondent's organisation. Thus, differences in the way employers were approached are the most likely reasons for the differences in outcomes noted in the table above.

*Awareness and Participation By Population Centre Type*

Table 10: Awareness and Participation By Population Centre Type

| Q2a/b/c Awareness and Participation | Year 2000 | Major Capital | Metro | Urban | Rural |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| RESPONDENTS | 2098 | 832 | 424 | 621 | 221 |
| | % | % | % | % | % |
| TOTAL AWARE | 33 | 28 | 30 | **46** | **44** |
| TOTAL EVER TOOK PART | 9 | 8 | 5 | 15 | 13 |
| Took part in last year | 5 | 4 | 3 | **10** | **9** |
| Aware, never took part | 24 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| TOTAL NOT AWARE | 67 | 72 | 70 | 54 | 56 |
| CONVERSION:<br>(Took part in Past Year as % of aware) | 16% | 13% | 12% | **23%** | **19%** |
| LOYALTY:<br>(Took part in Past Year as % of those who ever took part) | 59% | 49% | **69%** | **71%** | **68%** |

NOTE:

Major Capital = Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane, Adelaide or Perth
Metro = Other city with population of 100,000 or more (ABS estimates)
Urban = Under 100,000, at least 1000
Rural = Under 1000

- Classification of respondents by the size of the population centre where they were located was added in to the 2000 survey.

- Awareness and recent participation were both higher in the smaller urban and rural centres than in the major capitals and large regional cities - awareness being 45% vs 29%, and participation 14% vs 7%.

- Urban and rural organisations also were about 50% more likely to translate awareness into recent participation, with conversion ratios of 19-23% compared to 13% and 12% for the larger cities.

- Loyalty was notably lower in the major capital cities (49%) than in smaller centres (68-71%).

- Clearly, the Program has achieved higher levels of success in smaller towns and cities than in the major capital cities and large regional cities - in part because outside the major capitals, loyalty of those taking part has been higher.

*Awareness and Participation By State/Territory*

Table 11: Awareness and Participation By State/Territory

| Q2a/b/c Awareness and Participation | Year 2000 | NSW | Vic | Qld | SA | WA | Tas | NT | ACT |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| RESPONDENTS | 2098 | 592 | 444 | 402 | 178 | 201 | 126 | 60 | 95 |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| TOTAL AWARE | 33 | 29 | 29 | **40** | **42** | **37** | ***19*** | 29 | 45 |
| TOTAL EVER TOOK PART | 9 | 5 | 8 | **16** | **13** | 9 | 9 | 9 | 10 |
| Took part in last year | 5 | ***2*** | 6 | **9** | **7** | 4 | 4 | **9** | 6 |
| Aware, never took part | 24 | 24 | 21 | 24 | 29 | 28 | 10 | 20 | 35 |
| Aware - no extra prompting | 23 | 18 | 17 | **31** | **33** | **28** | 13 | **27** | 17 |
| Aware - after extra prompting | 10 | 11 | 11 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 29 |
| TOTAL NOT AWARE | 67 | 71 | 71 | 60 | 58 | 63 | 81 | 71 | 55 |
| Conversion Rate: (Took Part Past Year/Aware) | 16% | 7% | 21% | 23% | 16% | 12% | 22% | 31%* | 14%* |
| Loyalty: (Taking Part Past Year/ Ever Took Part) | 49% | 44% | 77% * | 58% | 53%* | 51%* | 46%* | ** | ** |

** Insufficient cases (≤10)

- Awareness and recent participation was clearly higher in Queensland, South Australia, Western Australia and the Northern Territory. This was also reflected in the higher level of respondents in these locations who claimed awareness of the Program without additional detailed prompting.

- NSW is surprisingly low in 2000 given the recent growth in student numbers enrolled in the Program. This gain has largely been in hospitality courses. Interviews within this industry happened to be low within NSW, which might explain the discrepancy between survey results and participation trends.

- The particularly low conversion rate in NSW might in part be due to the relatively low level of Hospitality and Tourism interviews in that State. Conversion from awareness to participation was highest in Queensland and Tasmania.

- The Loyalty rate calculates those taking part in the past year as a percentage of all those who have ever taken part. As only 216 cases have ever taken part, the base samples can be very small when this is broken down. However, the indications are that NSW and possibly Tasmania (base 17) were relatively low, while Victoria was high.

*Awareness and Participation By State/Territory By Year*

Table 12: Awareness and Participation By State/Territory By Year

| Q2a/b/c Awareness and Participation | Total | NSW | Vic | Qld | SA | WA | Tas | NT | ACT |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| TOTAL AWARE | | | | | | | | | |
| - 2000 | 33 | 29 | 29 | **40** | **42** | **37** | ***19*** | 29 | 45 |
| - 1998 | 47 | 43 | **55** | 45 | 45 | 47 | 47 | ***40*** | **55** |
| EVER TOOK PART | | | | | | | | | |
| - 2000 | 9 | 5 | 8 | **16** | **13** | 9 | 9 | 9 | 10 |
| - 1998 | 12 | 11 | 15 | 14 | ***5*** | 14 | 14 | **17** | **16** |
| TOOK PART PAST YEAR | | | | | | | | | |
| - 2000 | 5 | ***2*** | 6 | **9** | 7 | 4 | 4 | **9** | 6 |
| - 1998 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 11 | ***3*** | 9 | 10 | 12 | **16** |

- The absolute levels of awareness and participation for the 2000 and 1998 surveys cannot be reliably compared due to the change in the key items. However, variations by State can be compared, although the 1998 data might reflect differences in a wider range of work place Programs.

- The key point that is evident is that the States that were high or low in one survey differ from those that were high or low in the other. This is particularly true of the rate of participation in the current year. This would justify some caution for example in drawing conclusions from the low rate of recent participation in NSW. However, it would be reasonable to conclude that the low participation previously found in South Australia has been overcome, and the high levels of awareness and participation in the ACT have been sustained.

*Awareness and Participation By Industry*

Table 13: Awareness and Participation By Industry

| Q2a/b/c Awareness and Participation | Total | PI & M | Man. | U&C | Con | W/ sale | Ret-ail | Hos & Tour | Tran | Fin & Ins | Bus Serv | GEH & C | C & P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| RESPONDENTS | 2098 | 140 | 233 | 51 | 230 | 114 | 338 | 278 | 79 | 85 | 245 | 177 | 128 |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| TOTAL AWARE | 33 | 37 | 31 | 34 | **40** | 32 | ***26*** | **39** | 37 | 36 | 31 | 31 | ***25*** |
| TOTAL EVER TOOK PART | 9 | 11 | 10 | 15 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 11 | 8 | 2 | 12 | 7 | 7 |
| Took part in last year | 5 | 6 | 6 | **13** | 5 | 6 | 3 | **9** | 2 | ***1*** | 7 | ***2*** | 5 |
| Took part, not past yr | 4 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 2 |
| Aware, never took part | 24 | 27 | 21 | 19 | 32 | 24 | 20 | 28 | 29 | 34 | 19 | 23 | 18 |
| CONVERSION: (Taking part/Aware) | 16 | 16 | 20 | **39** | 13 | 17 | 13 | **23** | ***5*** | ***4*** | **24** | 8 | 20 |

NOTE: Base number insufficient to calculate meaningful Loyalty Ratios

PI & M. = Primary Industry and Mining
U & C= Utilities & communications
Hos & Tour = Hospitality & Tourism
Fin &Ins = Finance & Insurance
Man. = Manufacturing
Con = Construction & Building
Tran = Transport
Bus Serv = Property & Business Services
GEH&C = Government, Education, Health & Community Services
C & P = Cultural & Personal Services

- Awareness was significantly lower in Retail and in Cultural and Personal Services, and significantly higher in Construction, and in Hospitality and Tourism.

- Recent participation (past year) was significantly lower than average in Finance & Insurance, and in Government, Health, Education & Community Services. It was significantly higher in Utilities & Communications and in Hospitality & Tourism.

- Hospitality & Tourism is one of the most popular course areas in the Program. The significantly higher rate of recent participation is consistent with this.

- Finance & Insurance and Transport have the lowest conversion rates (although historically Transport appears to have been more willing to take students). The low rate for Finance could be due to the high proportion being located in Capital Cities (where participation is generally lower) or to the nature of the industry where concerns about sensitivity of information might restrict willingness to take students on placement.

- The conversion rate for Construction was quite low, so that despite the high level of awareness, participation was close to average. In some interviews, constraints due to safety regulations were mentioned as restrictions on acceptance of student placements.

- Utilities and Communications, Business Services and Hospitality & Tourism had the highest conversion rates. The Hospitality & Tourism result is consistent with the high level of student interest in this area.

### *Awareness and Participation By Industry By Year*

Table 14: Awareness and Participation By Industry By Year

| Q2a/b/c Awareness and Participation | Total | PI & M | Man. | U&C | Con | W/ sale | Ret-ail | Hos & Tour | Tran | Fin & Ins | Bus Serv | GEH & C | C & P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| AWARE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| - 2000 | 33 | 37 | 31 | 34 | **40** | 32 | ***26*** | **39** | 37 | 36 | 31 | 31 | ***25*** |
| - 1998 | 47 | 50 | ***39*** | 47 | ***31*** | 45 | 45 | 50 | 46 | ***38*** | **58** | **60** | 52 |
| EVER TOOK PART | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| - 2000 | 9 | 11 | 10 | **15** | 7 | 8 | 6 | 11 | 8 | 2 | 12 | 7 | 7 |
| - 1998 | 12 | 8 | 14 | 11 | 16 | 12 | 14 | **20** | 7 | 9 | 14 | **22** | 18 |
| TOOK PART IN | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| - 2000 | 5 | 6 | 6 | **13** | 5 | 6 | 3 | **9** | 2 | ***1*** | 7 | ***2*** | 5 |
| - 1998 | 9 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 4 | 9 | 12 | **14** | 4 | 8 | 11 | **15** | 10 |

PI & M. = Primary Industry and Mining
U & C= Utilities & Communications
Hos & Tour = Hospitality & Tourism
Fin &Ins = Finance & Insurance
Man. = Manufacturing
Con = Construction & Building
Tran = Transport
Bus Serv = Property & Business Services
GEH&C = Government, Education, Health & Community Services
C & P = Cultural & Personal Services

- Again, total variances can be examined between the surveys, but not the absolute levels.

- The rate of participation was consistently high for Hospitality and Tourism in both surveys, and this is consistent with what is known about the Program.

- The Government, Education, Health and Community Services sectors combined showed low participation in 2000, but were above average (especially the Government and Education sectors) in 1998. This might reflect some reduction in targeting of government and not for profit services by the Program overall.

- Retail had one of the higher participation rates in the 1998 survey, but was very low in 2000. This might have been due to a large proportion of the Retail interviews being completed in Sydney and Melbourne in 2000, where participation overall is relatively low.

### *Source of Awareness*

Table 15: Source of Awareness (Those Aware, Year 2000)

| Q1b HOW FIRST BECAME AWARE | |
|---|---|
| RESPONDENTS | 744<br>% |
| Unsure | 14 |
| Source of Awareness: | |
| By student | 23 |
| School | 21 |
| Media (type not stated) | 8 |
| Other (specify) | 5 |
| Word of mouth/friends | 4 |
| Newspaper | 4 |
| My children took part in it | 4 |
| Another business | 3 |
| Radio | 3 |
| Industry Associations | 3 |
| Someone within the company | 2 |
| Other training company/ organisation | 2 |
| Local coordinator | 1 |
| ECEF activities | 1 |
| Others each | ≤ 1 |

- The major channels for learning about the Program were contact with students or schools, with schools more often mentioned by Urban and Rural businesses, and students more often mentioned in the Major Capitals and Metro cities. Students were nearly three times more likely than schools to be mentioned by Head Offices.

- Industry Associations were reported as minor channels for gaining awareness of the Program.

- Word of mouth from a child who had taken part, other businesses or someone else within the organisation were more important (although still minor channels), as were media including newspapers and radio (total 15%).

- A substantial number (14%) were unsure how they had heard of the Program.

- Perhaps surprisingly, local coordinators were rarely mentioned - possibly being confused with contact by the school.

- As can be seen later, those taking part had a quite similar pattern of replies to this question, with slightly higher levels mentioning the school.

### *Source of Awareness - Recent Participants*

Table 16: Source of Awareness - Recent Participants vs All Aware

| Q1b HOW FIRST BECAME AWARE | All Aware | Recent Participant |
|---|---|---|
| RESPONDENTS | 744 | 159 |
| | % | % |
| Unsure | 14 | 16 |
| Source of Awareness: | | |
| By student | 23 | 23 |
| School | 21 | 27 |
| Media (type not stated) | 8 | 0 |
| Other (specify) | 5 | 2 |
| Word of mouth/friends | 4 | 3 |
| Newspaper | 4 | 1 |
| My children took part in it | 4 | 3 |
| Another business | 3 | <1 |
| Radio | 3 | 0 |
| Industry Associations | 3 | 11 |
| Someone within the company | 2 | 3 |
| Other training company/ organisation | 2 | 1 |
| Local coordinator | 1 | 5 |
| ECEF activities | 1 | 4 |
| Others each | ≤1 | ≤1 |

- For recent participants, the mix of sources for first awareness is different, suggesting that certain sources are more effective than others in winning participation. However, few of the shifts would be statistically significant, and the differences should be treated as suggestive rather than definitive.

- Students remained a leading source, being equally likely to be mentioned by recent participants and all those aware.

- Schools and especially local coordinators were more important for those participating.

- ECEF and some industry associations also appear to have been the source of awareness for recent participants.

- All other sources were lower, particularly all forms of media.

- As in the total sample who were aware of SWL, even among recent participants, local coordinators were behind students and schools as the source of first awareness. However, as the next table shows, they much more often had contacted recent participants. It appears that such contact is often not the first point of awareness, but is associated with participation *(see next page)*.

### *Who Contacted Respondents to Invite Participation in the Program*

Table 17: Who Contacted Respondents to Invite Participation in the Program

| Q9 WHO CONTACTED TO INVITE PARTICIPATION | All Aware | Recent Participant |
|---|---|---|
| RESPONDENTS | 744 | 159 |
| | % | % |
| No-one | 67 | 14 |
| Don't know whether contacted | 8 | 13 |
| Contacted by *(includes multiple replies)*: | | |
| School staff | 16 | **52** |
| Program Coordinator | 3 | **13** |
| Student(s) | 3 | 7 |
| Industry association | 2 | 3 |
| Training group/centre | 1 | 3 |
| Employment network/CES | 1 | 1 |
| Others each | ≤ 1 | ≤ 1 |

- Among the general population of businesses aware of the Program, the most common replies, when asked who had contacted them about the Program, was that no-one had done so, or that they did not know if there had been any contact (total 75%). For participants, only 27% gave these replies.

- This confirms the importance of making contact with a business rather than waiting for businesses to seek participation without prompting.

- The ratio between mentions by participants and mentions by all those aware helps to identify which channels of contact were more effective. The ratios were 3.25 for school staff, 4.33 for coordinators, and 2.33 for students, suggesting that coordinators were the most effective, and students the least effective. The base numbers for the other groups are too low to allow reliable conclusions to be drawn.

### *"Word of Mouth" Impressions*

Table 18: "Word of Mouth" Impressions - All aware vs Recent Participants

| Q10 WHAT HAS BEEN HEARD ABOUT THE PROGRAM | All Aware | Recent Participant |
|---|---|---|
| RESPONDENTS | 744 | 159 |
| *(NB - Multiple replies possible)* | % | % |
| Nothing | 76 | 74 |
| Heard something favourable | 19 | 20 |
| Heard something unfavourable | 4 | 9 |
| Heard mixed reports | 1 | <1 |
| Unsure | 2 | 2 |

- Informal news about the Program has not been a major source of information for those aware, or for those taking part.

- What has been heard was generally favourable.

- Recent participants were relatively more likely to recall having heard something unfavourable, perhaps because they were more involved, and so paid more attention. Clearly, this had not deterred them from taking part.

- The responses total to more than 100% because a few gave multiple replies, having heard both favourable and unfavourable comments.

## ***Information and Advice***

### *Where Information Would be Sought If Considering Program*

Table 19: Where Information Would be Sought If Considering Program

| SOURCE OF INFORMATION<br>Q11a POSSIBLE/Q11b ACTUAL | All Asked Not Taking Part (Q11a) | Recently Taking Part (Q11b) |
|---|---|---|
| RESPONDENTS | 1579 | 159 |
| | % | % |
| Would not consider taking students | 10 | na |
| Would/did not seek advice | 6 | 60 |
| Unsure | 34 | 3 |
| Would/did contact: | | |
| School | 29 | 24 |
| Centrelink | 5 | 0 |
| Local Coordinator | 4 | 3 |
| Industry Associations | 3 | 2 |
| Employment Agencies/Training Companies | 4 | 3 |
| Government Offices | 1 | 0 |
| TAFE | 2 | 0 |
| Local Chamber of Commerce | 1 | <1 |
| Others each | ≤1 | ≤1 |

- Only 10% of respondents not currently taking part said they would not consider taking students. Thus, the potential to expand the Program would appear to be considerable.

- A further 40% either were unsure of whom to contact or would not expect to seek advice.

- The school or coordinator accounted for most of the sources that would be used.

- The clearest message is that most businesses indicated they had little idea who to contact. Their Industry Association was not high on the list of possibilities.

- Those taking part in the past year were asked who they had contacted. Most (60%) replied no-one and a further 3% were unsure. The dominant reply for the rest was the school. For all those who ever took part (n=216), 58% said they had not sought advice, and 16% were unsure whether or where advice had been sought.

- It appears unlikely that businesses will themselves initiate contact and actively seek to participate in the Program. They either wait for someone to contact them, or do not find enough reason to act unless prompted by a contact from someone associated with the Program.

*Helpfulness of Advice Source - Recent Participants*

Table 20: Helpfulness of Advice Source - Recent Participants

| Q11b HELPFUL<br>Q11c MOST HELPFUL SOURCE OF ADVICE | Sample Base | ALL HELPFUL | MOST HELPFUL |
|---|---|---|---|
| | (Uwtd No.) | % | % |
| School | 45 | 79 | 64 |
| Employment Agency/CES | 5 | 100 | 7 |
| Local coordinator | 3 | 83 | 7 |
| Other training company/ organisation | 4 | 100 | 6 |
| Industry associations | 9 | 67 | 2 |
| Group Training Company | 4 | 100 | 1 |

- The number of participants who sought help was very low for most of the sources. However, while the large majority were seen as helpful, it appears that there have been schools and coordinators who did not provide the help sought. Industry associations were also not always found to be helpful when contacted.

- The other sources were uniformly considered helpful.

## *Consideration and Non Participation*

### *Consideration & Reasons for Non-Participation*

Table 21: Consideration & Reasons for Non-Participation

| Aware & Not Taking Part | |
|---|---|
| RESPONDENTS: | n=528 |
| Q2ai Ever Considered Taking Part<br>Yes | 14% |
| Considered, Did Not Go Ahead | |
| RESPONDENTS: | n=88 |
| Q2aii Reasons for not going ahead | % |
| Not enough benefit for business | 14 |
| Too busy to take on students | 13 |
| Did not get around to it | 11 |
| Poor experience with School Coordinator/Rep | 8 |
| Currently doing it/trying to get someone/plan to do it | 7 |
| Have no one able to supervise/manage students | 7 |
| Unsure | 7 |
| Concerned too disruptive | 6 |
| Did not know who to contact | 3 |

- Overall, only 14% of those aware and not taking part had considered doing so and decided not to.
- Among these respondents, the reasons given for not going ahead were varied. One third indicated that they were not convinced of the benefits for their particular business, were too busy or had no-one to supervise the students.
- One in six (15%) reported having had a poor experience with either the school or coordinator, or expressed concern that a placement might be disruptive. Thus, concerns based on adverse experience with the Program were a relatively minor element in deciding not to continue.
- Even clearer communication of Program benefits, and keeping up contact to encourage giving participation sufficient priority appear to be the main strategies suggested by these replies.

### *Reasons For Not Continuing*

Table 22: Reasons For Not Continuing

| Q2e REASON FOR NOT TAKING STUDENTS IN 2000 | Took Part Before, Not in Past Year |
|---|---|
| RESPONDENTS | 54<br>% |
| Don't need/Can't use student | 38 |
| No one contacted me | 34 |
| Unsure | 8 |
| There were no good students | 7 |
| Not enough benefit for business | 5 |
| Poor experience with School Coordinator/Representative | 4 |
| Had no one able to supervise/manage students | 2 |
| Did not get around to it | 2 |
| Too busy to take on students | 1 |

- Lack of perceived need, inability to make use of the student and lack of contact were the main reasons why those who had taken part previously did not take part in 2000. Examples of reasons for lack of need or inability to use students were lack of (office) space, effect of restructuring, and reduced workloads.

- Only 7% found there were no students they considered good enough, and a few judged there was not enough benefit for their business. The question was not asked in 1998. However, in 1998 those who were dissatisfied were asked their reasons, with 26% attributing this to student disinterest, and 14% saying they had the wrong student for their business. This comparison suggests that improvements have been achieved in this area since 1998.

- Others were too busy or just did not get around to doing what was required.

- Whether lack of contact was due to schools or coordinators not having suitable students, or for other reasons, it appears that there would be some value in systematic follow up of previous participants, even if it is not intended to place any students with them in a given year. This might also help to overcome some of the circumstances that led to a lack of need or inability to use a student.

## *Overall Attitude*

### *Overall Attitude By Size*

Table 23: Overall Attitude By Size

| Q5a OVERALL ATTITUDE TO PROGRAM | EMPLOYEES IN AUSTRALIA | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | 2 to 5 | 6 to 19 | 20 to 99 | 100-199 | 200+ |
| RESPONDENTS | 2098 | 755 | 610 | 387 | 123 | 223 |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| A good idea, for your organisation | 42 | 42 | 41 | 47 | 43 | **51** |
| A good idea, but not for your organisation | 55 | 54 | 57 | 47 | 53 | 46 |
| Not a good idea at all | 3 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 3 |

- When analysed by organisation size, the largest organisations (those with 200 or more employees) were significantly more positive to taking part than the average.
- While those in the 20-99 range were also somewhat more positive, this difference was not large enough to be significant.

### *Overall Attitude By Population Centre Type*

Table 24: Overall Attitude By Population Centre Type

| Q5a OVERALL ATTITUDE TO PROGRAM | Year 2000 | Population Centre Type | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Major Capital | Metro | Urban | Rural |
| RESPONDENTS | 2098 | 832 | 424 | 621 | 221 |
| | % | % | % | % | % |
| A good idea, for your organisation | 42 | 41 | ***36*** | **49** | **49** |
| A good idea, but not for your organisation | 55 | 55 | 62 | 48 | 50 |
| Not a good idea at all | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 |

NOTE:

Major Capital = Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane, Adelaide or Perth
Metro = Other city with population of 100,000 or more (ABS estimates)
Urban = Under 100,000, at least 1000
Rural = Under 1000

- Those in the smaller cities and towns were significantly more positive about the relevance of the Program to their organisation than those in the large regional cities and in the major capitals.

### *Overall Attitude By State/Territory*

Table 25: Overall Attitude By State/Territory

| Q5a OVERALL ATTITUDE TO PROGRAM | Year 2000 | NSW | Vic | Qld | SA | WA | Tas | NT | ACT |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| RESPONDENTS | 2098 | 592 | 444 | 402 | 178 | 201 | 126 | 60 | 95 |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| A good idea, for your organisation | 42 | 45 | 46 | 38 | 40 | ***33*** | 44 | ***28*** | **60** |
| A good idea, but not for your organisation | 55 | 52 | 51 | 58 | 59 | 63 | 55 | 67 | 38 |
| Not a good idea at all | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 2 |

- There were significant variations in the perceived appropriateness of the Program for the respondent's own organisation. This was significantly higher in the ACT and significantly lower in the NT and WA.

- For WA, part of the difference could be due to the relative over-representation of the Construction industry in that State (35% vs 9% nationally), and also of the Transport & Storage industry (18% vs 4%). These industries had lower levels of acceptance of the Program, and thus would have pulled results down for WA. The high proportion of business in the Property & Business Services sector in the NT (40% vs 13% overall) could have contributed to the lower acceptance of the Program in the Territory.

- There were no significant variations in overall attitude, with no State or Territory showing more than 5% saying the Program was not a good idea at all.

*Overall Attitude By Office Type, Association Membership & Recruitment Difficulty*

Table 26: Overall Attitude By Office Type, Association Membership and Recruitment Difficulty

| Q5a OVERALL ATTITUDE TO PROGRAM | Year 2000 | Head Office | Branch Office | Sole Site | Industry Assoc'n Member | Not Assoc'n Member | Recruit Difficulty Yes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| RESPONDENTS | 2098 | 374 | 258 | 1385 | 1277 | 695 | 589 |
|  | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| A good idea, for your organisation | 42 | 40 | 45 | 42 | 43 | 42 | 54 |
| A good idea, but Not for your organisation | 55 | 57 | 50 | 55 | 54 | 54 | 43 |
| Not a good idea at all | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3% |

- There were no differences by type of office (head office, branch office or sole site) in either overall attitude to the Program, or acceptance that it is relevant to the respondent's own organisation.

- Nor were there any differences in the attitude to the Program by whether the organisation was a member of a business association. Thus, the greater awareness and history of participation found for association members did not translate into a greater acceptance of the relevance of the Program to the organisation.

- A higher proportion of employers with recruitment difficulties believes that the Program is a good idea for their organisation. As will be seen later, this is consistent with the expected benefit of the Program as an efficient and effective method of recruitment.

### *Overall Attitude By Industry*

Table 27: Overall Attitude By Industry

| Q5a OVERALL ATTITUDE TO PROGRAM | Total | PI & M | Man. | U&C | Con | W/ sale | Ret-ail | Hos & Tour | Tran | Fin & Ins | Bus Serv | GEH & C | C & P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| RESPONDENTS | 2098 | 140 | 233 | 51 | 230 | 114 | 338 | 278 | 79 | 85 | 245 | 177 | 128 |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| A good idea for your organisation | 42 | 42 | 37 | 52 | ***33*** | 43 | **50** | **50** | 35 | ***26*** | 40 | **52** | 36 |
| A good idea but not for your organisation | 55 | 57 | 60 | 44 | 64 | 51 | 44 | 47 | 57 | 68 | 59 | 45 | 59 |
| Not a good idea at all | 3 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 5 |

PI & M. = Primary Industry and Mining
U & C= Utilities & Communications
Hos & Tour = Hospitality & Tourism
Fin &Ins = Finance & Insurance

Man. = Manufacturing
Con = Construction & Building
Tran = Transport
Bus Serv = Property & Business Services

GEH&C = Government, Education, Health & Community Services
C & P = Cultural & Personal Services

- Overall attitude to the Program did not vary significantly between industries, with almost all respondents in every industry seeing it as a good idea. The least in favour was Transport (92%), with almost 100% in favour amongst Primary Industries and Mining.

- There were significant variations in acceptance of the Program as relevant for the respondent's organisation. Specifically, acceptance was significantly higher for the total Government, Education, Health and Community Services sector, and for the Hospitality and Tourism and Retail industries. Utilities and Communications were also more positive, but the difference was not significant given the small sample base.

- Relevance was significantly lower within the Construction and the Finance & Insurance industries. This is consistent with the lower conversion rate for Finance & Insurance (4%), although Construction was only just below average (13% vs 16%). Manufacturing and Transport also had relatively low rates of considering the Program as relevant, and Transport also had a very low conversion rate.

- The stronger acceptance of relevance within Retail and Hospitality & Tourism is encouraging, as these are areas where a large proportion of the students seek to undertake their courses. Given the somewhat lower participation found in the Retail sector (3% in the past year), there appears to be potential to expand in this area if the reasons for the low conversion rate in 2000 can be identified and addressed.

## ***Program Benefits***

### *Specific Program Benefits Expected from Participation*

Table 28: Specific Program Benefits Expected From Participation

| Q6a LEVEL OF BENEFIT FOR ORGANISATION | Increasing Product-ivity | Enhance Skills Base | More Efficient & Effective Recruitment | Comm-unity Recog-nition | Personal Satisfaction for Staff | Improve Bottom Line |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| RESPONDENTS | 2098 | 2098 | 2098 | 2098 | 2098 | 2098 |
| Year 2000 Survey | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| TOTAL SEEING ANY BENEFIT | 35 | 34 | 46 | 50 | 56 | 22 |
| A great deal of benefit | 6 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 11 | 4 |
| Some benefit | 29 | 29 | 38 | 41 | 45 | 18 |
| Not much benefit at all | 65 | 66 | 54 | 50 | 44 | 78 |
| 1998 Survey | | | | | | |
| TOTAL SEEING ANY BENEFIT | 33 | 38 | 53 | 55 | 60 | 25 |

- The expected benefits from Program participation were in the same order in both surveys, with personal satisfaction of staff, community recognition and more effective recruitment the most widely expected benefits, and improvements to the bottom line the least.

- Few respondents expected any of the benefits to be major.

- The proportion who saw each benefit as flowing from the Program was slightly lower in the Year 2000 survey, with the largest drop being in perceptions of more efficient and effective recruitment (down by 7%).

- Overall, 25% did not expect any of the benefits would occur; nearly two thirds (62%) expected two or more benefits would occur, but only 9% expected all six would occur.

### *Expected Benefits By Participation & Program Attitude*

Table 29: Expected Benefits By Participation & Program Attitude

| BENEFIT EXPECTED FROM PROGRAM (A lot + Some, %) | 2000 Total Sample | Took Part Past Year | Good Idea | Not For Us | Not a Good Idea | INDEX: (Good idea)/ (Not for us) | Recruit Difficult Yes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| RESPONDENTS | 2098 | 159 | 983 | 1036 | 79 | (100 x ratio) | |
| Improved bottom line | 22 | 25 | **35** | 13 | 10 | 269 | 34 |
| Enhancing Co. skill base | 34 | 37 | **50** | 23 | 20 | 217 | 46 |
| Increasing productivity | 35 | **44** | **49** | 26 | ***12*** | 188 | 49 |
| More efficient & effective recruitment | 46 | **55** | 59 | 37 | ***23*** | 159 | 64 |
| Personal Satisfaction of staff | 56 | **78** | **71** | 47 | ***13*** | 151 | 63 |
| Community Recognition | 50 | 55 | **60** | 44 | ***24*** | 136 | 59 |
| None of these | 25 | 15 | ***13*** | 32 | **55** | na | 16 |

- Each of the six benefits was more likely to be endorsed by those who accepted the relevance of the Program. Most (87%) endorsed at least one benefit, much higher than for those who reject the relevance of the Program (68%).

- The "Index" is the ratio between the percent endorsing the benefit in the "Good idea for us" group, over the percent endorsing it in the "not for us" group, multiplied by 100. If no discrimination, the index is 100. The higher the index above 100, the stronger the discrimination.

- The strongest discriminator was improved bottom line, with the 'for us' group well over twice as likely expected to see some bottom line benefit - perhaps because the base level for this among those not seeing the Program as relevant was so low. The next was enhancing the company's skill base, followed by increased productivity.

- Thus, the "hard" benefits were the most discriminating.

- However the benefits more often reported by current participants were personal satisfaction of staff, more efficient and effective recruitment and community recognition followed by increased productivity, in that order.

- More employers reporting recruitment difficulties expected the benefit from the Program to assist in solving their recruitment difficulties.

- Thus, while the "hard" benefits might appear more convincing, there is a greater acceptance of the softer benefits such as staff satisfaction, and the more immediate potential benefits in terms of recruitment (eg. better pool of candidates, "try before you buy") and increased productivity (students doing useful work). Employers are likely to be skeptical of claims of bottom line benefits. Community recognition was experienced by over half of participants but is not so effective as a "driver" of acceptance (index 136 vs 151 for staff satisfaction).

*Expected Benefits By Population Centre Type*

Table 30: Expected Benefits By Population Centre Type

| BENEFITS EXPECTED FROM PARTICIPATION | Year 2000 | Major Capital | Metro | Urban | Rural |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| RESPONDENTS | 2098 | 832 | 424 | 621 | 221 |
| BENEFIT: | % | % | % | % | % |
| Increasing productivity | 35 | 34 | 36 | 37 | 40 |
| Enhancing the company's skill base | 34 | 33 | ***28*** | **43** | 37 |
| More efficient & effective recruitment | 46 | 43 | 48 | 54 | 44 |
| Community Recognition | 50 | 48 | 47 | **58** | **56** |
| Personal Satisfaction of staff | 56 | ***50*** | 69 | 60 | 69 |
| Improved bottom line | 22 | 21 | 20 | **28** | 23 |
| None of these | 25 | **30** | 15 | 17 | 20 |
| Mean Number of benefits | 2.43 | 2.28 | 2.48 | 2.79 | 2.70 |

NOTE:

Major Capital = Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane, Adelaide or Perth
Metro = Other city with population of 100,000 or more (ABS estimates)
Urban = Under 100,000, at least 1000
Rural = Under 1000

- There was a trend, although not consistent for every type of benefit, for those located in small cities and rural towns to acknowledge more areas of benefit, as shown by the mean number endorsed. While 30% of those in major capitals endorsed none of the benefits, this was less common for the other size ranges (15-20%).

- This is consistent with the differences in participation rates and in the overall attitude to the Program and its relevance for the respondent's organisation.

- It is not surprising that businesses operating in smaller cities and rural towns were more likely to expect they could gain community recognition from participation. It is less obvious why they would be more likely to expect there would be gains in the personal satisfaction of staff, unless managers in such locations see their staff as having more "community spirit" - which might well be the case.

### *Expected Benefits By Number of Employees*

Table 31: Expected Benefits By Number of Employees

| BENEFITS EXPECTED FROM PARTICIPATION | Year 2000 | 2 to 5 | 6 to 19 | 20 to 99 | 100 to 199 | 200+ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| RESPONDENTS | 2098 | 755 | 610 | 387 | 123 | 223 |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Increasing productivity | 35 | 37 | ***31*** | 37 | 26 | 40 |
| Enhancing the company's skill base | 34 | 35 | ***31*** | 39 | 38 | 40 |
| More efficient & effective recruitment | 46 | 47 | 43 | 48 | 53 | 50 |
| Community Recognition | 50 | 52 | 46 | 49 | **66** | 54 |
| Personal Satisfaction of staff | 56 | 57 | 54 | 52 | **64** | **65** |
| Improved bottom line | 22 | 22 | 22 | **29** | 19 | 26 |
| None of these | 25 | 23 | 29 | 26 | 18 | 21 |
| Mean Number | 2.43 | 2.49 | 2.45 | 2.54 | 2.65 | 2.76 |

- As in 1998, there was a trend for the larger organisations (especially those with 100 or more employees) to expect a wider range of benefits. Although not completely consistent for each individual benefit, this overall pattern was quite clear.

- Organisations with 100 or more employees are more likely to expect there will be some benefits to the organisation from taking part - which is consistent with the higher rate of participation among such organisations.

- The largest differences favouring larger businesses were evident for community recognition and personal satisfaction of staff.

*Expected Benefits By Industry*

Table 32: Expected Benefits By Industry

| Q5a OVERALL ATTITUDE TO PROGRAM | Above Average | | | | Average | | | | | Below Average | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Year 2000 | U & C | Hos & Tour | Ret-ail | P.I. & M | Man. | W/ sale | G.E.H. & C.S. | C. & P. Serv | Bus. Serv | Tran | F&I | Con |
| RESPONDENTS | 2098 | 51 | 278 | 338 | 140 | 233 | 114 | 177 | 128 | 245 | 79 | 85 | 230 |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Personal Satisfaction of staff | 56 | 57 | 60 | 58 | 59 | 58 | 53 | 55 | 52 | 57 | 47 | 45 | 54 |
| Community Recognition | 50 | **63** | 55 | 51 | 52 | 51 | 53 | 53 | 54 | 46 | 41 | 49 | 47 |
| More efficient & effective recruitment | 46 | **57** | 50 | 51 | 51 | 45 | 41 | 44 | 36 | 42 | 44 | 43 | 43 |
| Increasing productivity | 35 | 36 | 36 | 39 | 41 | 37 | 31 | 38 | 35 | 30 | 32 | 25 | ***26*** |
| Enhancing the company's skill base | 34 | 35 | 40 | 41 | 37 | 36 | 39 | 32 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 28 | ***21*** |
| Improved bottom line | 22 | **32** | **32** | 27 | 20 | 32 | 22 | 21 | 29 | 19 | 14 | 22 | 18 |
| None of these | 25 | ***15*** | ***19*** | ***20*** | 30 | 25 | 19 | 22 | 22 | 23 | 28 | **32** | 29 |
| Mean Number | 2.43 | **2.80** | **2.73** | **2.66** | 2.60 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 2.43 | 2.4 | ***2.25*** | ***2.12*** | ***2.12*** | ***2.06*** |

PI & M. = Primary Industry and Mining
U & C= Utilities & communications
Hos & Tour = Hospitality & Tourism
Fin &Ins = Finance & Insurance

Man. = Manufacturing
Con = Construction & Building
Tran = Transport
Bus Serv = Property & Business Services

GEH&C = Government, Education, Health & Community Services
C & P = Cultural & Personal Services

- Respondents from three industries were consistently more likely to acknowledge benefits from participation. Two were the industries with higher participation rates - Utilities and Communication, and Hospitality & Tourism. One, Retail, had a below average participation rate.

- Four industries had consistently lower expectations of benefit. These were industries with lower than average participation rates - Construction & Building, Finance & Insurance, Transport, and Property & Business Services.

- The differences were not concentrated on particular benefits, although improvement to the bottom line and an enhanced skill base were more consistently high among the industries where benefits were more strongly expected. It appears that some industries simply accept a wider range of benefits are possible, rather than being more likely to expect a specific benefit.

### *Importance of Benefits*

To understand these results, it is important to note exactly how the question was asked. It was phrased as follows:

> *Q8. Thinking of what your organisation values in terms of these types of provisions of structured work placements, how important is it that any Program delivers benefits in each of the following areas? Would you say that it is very important, moderately important, slightly important or not at all important that the Program delivers benefits in the area of….*

Table 33: Importance of Benefits (Year 2000 Survey)

| Q8 IMPORTANCE OF PROGRAM DELIVERING SPECIFIED BENEFIT | Very Important | Moderately important | Slightly important | Not at all important | Don't Know |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Personal Satisfaction of staff | 32 | 34 | 13 | 17 | 4 |
| Increasing productivity | 31 | 27 | 15 | 22 | 5 |
| Improved bottom line | 29 | 17 | 15 | 33 | 5 |
| More efficient & effective recruitment | 29 | 30 | 15 | 21 | 5 |
| Enhancing the company's skill base | 27 | 26 | 17 | 26 | 4 |
| Community Recognition | 18 | 29 | 17 | 31 | 4 |

- All but “improved bottom line” and “community recognition” are rated as at least moderately important by half or more.

- About one third see bottom line gains as not at all important (33%) as a benefit from participating in the Program, similar to community recognition.

- Community recognition is least motivating, with only 18% considering it very important.

- Perhaps some of those who see certain benefits as important do not recognise how that benefit will translate into gains for the bottom line. Despite this, we have seen that the Program is well accepted. It would appear that acceptance of the Program can be sold without having to appeal to bottom line benefits or benefit to the community as a whole.

### *Importance of Benefits: 1998 vs 2000*

Table 34: Importance of Benefits: 2000 vs 1998

| IMPORTANCE OF PROGRAM DELIVERING SPECIFIED BENEFIT | 2000 Important (Very + Mod) | 1998 Important (Very + Some) |
|---|---|---|
| Personal Satisfaction of staff | 66 | 79 |
| More efficient & effective recruitment | 59 | 70 |
| Increasing productivity | 58 | 67 |
| Enhancing the company's skill base | 52 | 67 |
| Community Recognition | 47 | 56 |
| Improved bottom line | 47 | 54 |

- The importance the Program delivering benefits is shown here in order based on the total rating for importance. The first column shows the total rating for the benefits as either very or moderately important in 2000, the second column is the sum of those rating the benefit as either very or somewhat important in 1998.

- High ratings for recruitment, skill base and community recognition were more common in the 1998 survey but this could in part be due to the change in the scale labels, with the second box labeled "somewhat important" in 1998, and "moderately important" in 2000. If the rating of "slightly important" in 2000 was to be included then the ratings in 2000 would exceed the ratings in 1998.

### *Importance of Benefits By Recent Participation & Overall Attitude to the Program*

Table 35: Importance of Benefits By Recent Participation & Overall Attitude to the Program

| Q8 SPECIFIED BENEFIT RATED AS VERY/MODERATELY IMPORTANT | 2000 Total Sample | Took Part Past Year | Good Idea | Not For Us | Not a Good Idea | INDEX: (Good idea)/ (Not for us) | Recruit Difficulty Yes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| RESPONDENTS | 2098 | 159 | 983 | 1036 | 79 | Ratio x 100 | 589 |
| Personal Satisfaction of staff | 66 | **86** | **75** | 61 | ***44*** | **123** | 76 |
| Increasing productivity | 58 | 52 | **64** | 55 | ***44*** | **116** | 69 |
| Improved bottom line | 47 | ***32*** | 50 | ***44*** | 48 | **114** | 58 |
| More efficient & effective recruitment | 59 | **65** | **67** | 53 | 55 | **126** | 75 |
| Enhancing company's skill base | 52 | 51 | **61** | 46 | 44 | **133** | 61 |
| Community Recognition | 47 | 45 | **54** | 43 | ***33*** | **126** | 47 |

- Compared to the total sample, those who participated in the past year placed even greater emphasis on the importance of staff satisfaction and benefits for recruitment, and less on the importance of benefits for the bottom line. This suggests that, for employers taking part, staff satisfaction was a strong motivator, while benefits for the bottom line were not.

- Only three benefits were endorsed by more than half of those who had taken part, suggesting that these are sufficient for justifying participation and that employers do not consider it important to have more benefits.

- Those who saw the Program as relevant to their organisation generally placed more emphasis on all the benefits than did those who saw the Program as good, but not for their own organisation. However, the importance of the benefits was not as strongly related to relevance as was the expectation that the benefits would be achieved, as shown by the lower index ratios.

- Productivity and improvement to the bottom line (the "hard" benefits) were the least differentiating. This again suggests that the softer benefits might be sufficient to motivate adequate levels of participation.

- For most of the benefits, the small group who did not consider the Program a good idea at all rated all the benefits as less important.

- More employers with recruitment difficulties rated the importance of more effective recruitment a benefit, matching the level of personal satisfaction for staff, and fewer rated the importance of community benefit. This suggests these employers are more focussed on the looking to the Program for their organisational needs.

*How Benefits Achieved*

The panels below summarise the answers, split by the general type of benefit, when respondents were asked how they expected the benefits would be achieved.

| Productivity (n=742) | % |
|---|---|
| Useful work | 52 |
| Free staff | 40 |
| Contribute (eg new ideas) | 12 |
| Better recruits | 2 |
| Other ways each | <2 |

| Skill Base (n=774) | % |
|---|---|
| Better performance assessment | 18 |
| Better team work | 16 |
| Re-think jobs when training | 13 |
| Change to learning organisation | 13 |
| Training for staff | 13 |
| Added skills | 10 |
| Students contribute ideas | 5 |
| Students gain experience | 4 |
| Better recruits | 3 |

| Recruitment (n=982) | % |
|---|---|
| Better fit | 53 |
| Improve pool | 19 |
| Better recruits | 17 |
| Lower - | |
| - recruitment costs | 11 |
| - turnover | 10 |
| - agency costs | 9 |
| Other ways each | <2 |

- For most of the areas one or two replies dominated.
- Productivity gains were expected from the actual work done by students and by freeing staff. Some also expected students to contribute new ideas. Longer term, a few saw that the Program could improve productivity by improving the quality of recruits.
- There was greater diversity in the ways that the Program was expected to enhance the skill base - through improving staff skills in performance assessment, improving team work, staff re-thinking issues when training the students, a general shift towards being a learning organisation, the training provided for staff, and general additions of skills. A few expected students would contribute ideas, or the quality of recruits could rise.
- For recruitment, the dominant means for improvement was through acquiring recruits who better fit the organisation, because they have already tried it - a process reflected in all of the top three replies. The other major theme was reduced recruitment costs.

- Replies about how community recognition would be achieved largely assumed that if the organisation does something for the community, this will simply be recognised. The more specific ways that benefits flow from this were through either increased customer loyalty or winning new customers

| **Community Recognition** (n=1129) | % |
|---|---|
| Provide community service | 57 |
| Customer goodwill | 26 |
| Contribute to local educ'n | 26 |
| Gain new customers | 11 |
| Other commun'y recognition | 7 |
| Customers buy more | 2 |
| Other ways, each | <2 |

| **Staff Satisfaction** (n=1199) | % |
|---|---|
| Feel good giving knowledge | 54 |
| General better morale | 40 |
| Enjoy extra responsibility | 17 |
| Freed for other work | 2 |
| Other ways, each | <2 |

| **Bottom Line** *(Asked of All)* (n=2098 | % |
|---|---|
| No bottom line benefits | 62 |
| Students do useful work | 11 |
| Increased productivity | 8 |
| Less cost to get work done | 7 |
| Increased sales | 2 |
| Good PR/image | 2 |
| Other ways each | <2 |

- Benefits to staff satisfaction were apparently considered almost automatic - that the Program would make staff feel good and enhance morale. A more specific explanation offered by some was that staff would gain satisfaction from the increased responsibility.

- All respondents were asked in what ways (if any) participation could contribute to the organisation's bottom line. Over half (62%) said they could not see any benefit.

- Those that could see possibility of bottom line benefits mostly mentioned the consequences of the work done by the students, with a few mentions of increased sales.

- It appears likely that many respondents who had already mentioned various benefits that could produce bottom line gains either did not bother to repeat these, or had not thought them through to see the ultimate link to the bottom line.

- Thus seeking to convince decision-makers that bottom line benefits can be achieved is probably not an appropriate strategy. It appears likely that such arguments would not be accepted. Most of those who accepted the Program as relevant did not expect such benefits. Further, those who have taken part were less likely to consider bottom line benefits important.

***Attitudes***

*Attitudes For and Against the Program*

Table 36: Employers' Attitudes For and Against the Program

| Q7 Attitudes | AGREE | | | Neither | Disagree | | Don't Know |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | TOTAL | Strongly | Agree | | Disagree | Strongly | |
| **Favourable Attitudes** | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Would like to take (more) students | 35 | 2 | 33 | 21 | 33 | 6 | 4 |
| Would bear some of direct cost | 15 | 1 | 14 | 13 | 45 | 21 | 6 |
| **Unfavourable attitudes** | | | | | | | |
| Too much staff time | 52 | 13 | 40 | 13 | 29 | 3 | 4 |
| Not the type of student wanted | 29 | 7 | 23 | 20 | 37 | 4 | 10 |
| *Participants only*<br>Assessment process after the placement not good | 37 | 7 | 29 | 13 | 34 | 6 | 10 |

- We have already seen that some of the benefits reported by participants are in fact widely recognised within the business community, and that more are endorsed by those in industries with higher rates of participation.

- Three of the attitude statements probe possible barriers to participation. Responses to these items showed that the amount of staff time required was an issue for about half the sample, and concern about whether the students supplied would be of the right type was endorsed by 29%. Over one third (37%) of the participants considered the assessment process insufficient.

- Respondents from the Major Capitals (55%), and two States (NSW 59%, and WA 57%) were more likely to agree with the concern about taking staff time. Other differences were not significant.

- About one in three of all the businesses surveyed were willing to take students. Half (50%) of those recently taking students, and 43% of lapsed participants were willing to take more students. Manufacturing was the most positive sector (44% willing), and Finance & Insurance the least willing sector (21%). Lapsed participants were well above the average in willingness to take students (43%), emphasising the importance of following them up in subsequent years.

- Some (15% overall) were willing to bear some of the direct costs of the Program, with manufacturing again relatively high (22%). Although this suggests that imposing a cost on the participants would not enhance acceptance of the Program, this was higher (24%) for recent participants who were very satisfied with the Program. Thus, some might be willing to make a contribution if approached.

### *Attitudes For and Against the Program By Overall Participation & Attitude*

Table 37: Attitudes For and Against the Program By Participation & Overall Attitude

| Q7 Attitudes (% Total Agree) | 2000 Total Sample | Good Idea | Not For Us | Not a Good Idea | Took Part Past Year | Recruit Difficulty Yes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Favourable Attitudes** | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Would like to take (more) students | 35 | **59** | 18 | 13 | **50** | 40 |
| Would bear some of direct cost | 15 | **26** | 7 | 4 | **23** | 19 |
| **Unfavourable attitudes** | | | | | | |
| Too much staff time | 52 | ***39*** | 62 | **68** | ***37*** | 56 |
| Not the type of student wanted | 29 | ***15*** | 39 | **55** | ***17*** | 27 |
| *Participants only*<br>Assessment process not good | 37 | 37 | 34 | * | **40** | |

* Sample too small to be meaningful

- The specific attitudes were all strongly related to the overall attitude to the Program.

- Willingness to take students was highly related to Program acceptance, with a majority (59%) of those who rated the idea as a "good one for us" agreeing they would be willing to take students, while willingness was under 20% for others.

- While 62% of those who rejected the Program for them believed it would take too much staff time, a considerable proportion (39%) of those who were positive about the Program, and a similar proportion (37%) of recent participants also held this view. Thus, time demands have proved to be of less of a concern for those with experience with the Program and it did not cause rejection of the Program.

- The belief that the students will not be of the type needed can be a real barrier to participation and relevance. Among those with experience of students, however, very few found that the students were unsuitable. It appears that the selection and preparation process has generally produced appropriate placements.

- For those most positive about the Program and those who had recently taken part, about a quarter would be willing to contribute to the cost. Thus there is some potential to invite participants to share costs, but a requirement to contribute could reduce participation.

- 40% of those who took part in the past year felt the assessment process at the end of the placement was not good enough, as did 37% of those who had ever taken part.

- Employers with recruitment difficulties are more demanding of the Program than those in general who think it is a good idea. This is perhaps due to concerns that the Program takes up too much staff time, and at a time when they are short of staff.

## ***Persuasiveness***

### *Persuasiveness of Strategies to Encourage Participation*

Table 38: Persuasiveness of Strategies to Encourage Participation

| Q13 CONSIDERATIONS LIKELY TO PERSUADE | TOTAL LIKELY | Very likely | Likely | Unlikely | Very unlikely | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Personal approach by local school or coordinator | 55 | 9 | 46 | 23 | 16 | 7 |
| Personal recommendation by someone in your industry | 54 | 10 | 44 | 23 | 16 | 7 |
| Student testimonials | 39 | 4 | 35 | 36 | 18 | 7 |
| Publicity by local schools of your role | 37 | 6 | 31 | 35 | 22 | 7 |
| Endorsement by a large employer in your industry | 37 | 4 | 33 | 33 | 20 | 10 |
| Contact by a national co-ordinating organistion | 37 | 4 | 34 | 35 | 19 | 9 |
| Industry Association formal recommendation | 37 | 5 | 32 | 25 | 17 | 22 |
| Training for your staff | 33 | 5 | 28 | 35 | 24 | 9 |
| Suggestion from senior management | 26 | 5 | 21 | 13 | 15 | 45 |

- A personal approach by a local school or coordinator was most likely to be persuasive, closely followed by a personal recommendation by someone in the respondent's industry (54-55% agreed). This strongly supports the use of industry coordinators and gaining testimonials for each industry sector.

- Most of the other suggestions were each considered persuasive by around one in three of the respondents. For a few of the respondents (4-10%) none of the suggestions were considered very likely to be persuasive.

- A recommendation from an Industry Association was considered persuasive by 49% of members. For non-members a recommendation from an Industry Association was considered applicable by 20% of respondents.

- Suggestion or direction by senior management was also not considered applicable by a large proportion of the sample (45%). For those who did consider it applicable, this would be persuasive for 47%, rising to 69% for those working in a branch office.

- Persuasiveness of contact by a national coordinating organisation was lower for sole site organisations (37%) than branch offices (46%) or head offices (43%). It was also higher for organisations with recruitment difficulties (51%).

- Student testimonials (39% persuasive overall) were seen as less likely to persuade by Head Offices (30%) and more likely by businesses with recruitment difficulties (56%).

*Persuasiveness - 1998 and 2000*

Table 39: Persuasiveness - 1998 and 2000

| Q13 CONSIDERATIONS LIKELY TO PERSUADE* (Very Likely + Likely, %) | 1998 | 2000 |
|---|---|---|
| Personal approach by local school or coordinator | n/a | 55 |
| Personal recommendation by someone in your industry | 65 | 54 |
| Student testimonials | 55 | 39 |
| Publicity by local schools of your role | 53 | 37 |
| Endorsement by a large employer in your industry | 51 | 37 |
| Contact by a national co-ordinating organistion | n/a | 37 |
| Industry Association formal recommendation | 58 | 37 |
| Training for your staff | 48 | 33 |
| Suggestion from senior management | 42 | 26 |

* 1998 - How likely to make respondent feel positive about taking students

* 2000 - How likely to make the respondent take students

- Comparisons between 1998 and 2000 should focus more on differences in the relative ratings of the influences, rather than the absolute levels, as the questions were slightly different.

- The order was very similar for the items included in both surveys. The exceptions were recommendation by an industry association, which was relatively stronger in 1998 (but was often rated as not applicable in 2000, by 22%); and recommendation by senior management (also often rated not applicable in 2000, by 45%, see previous table).

- The potentially most powerful influences appear to be a direct contact from a school or coordinator, and personal recommendation by someone within the same industry.

### *Program Participants*

Some data from Program participants have already been reported, where there were useful comparisons with the data from the total sample.

A number of items were only asked of recent and/or lapsed participants. Results from these are summarised here.

*Number of Students Taking Part in Past Twelve Months*

Table 40: Number of Students Taking Part in Past Twelve Months

| Q2c NUMBER OF STUDENTS TAKING PART IN PAST 12 MONTHS | Year 2000 |
|---|---|
| RESPONDENTS | 159 |
| | % |
| One | 56 |
| Two | 16 |
| Three | 5 |
| Four | 9 |
| Five | 5 |
| Six or more | 6 |
| Don't Know | 3 |
| Mean Number of Students Taken - All Participants | 2.25 |
| **Mean Number Taken by Organisation Size** | |
| 2-5 Employees (n=40) | 1.44 |
| 6-10 Employees (n=49) | 2.95 |
| 20-99 Employees (n=39) | 3.63 |
| 100-199 Employees (n=11) | 3.15 |
| 200+ Employees (n=20) | 6.10 |

- There was marked variation in the numbers of students taken in the past year, ranging from the most common response (one, from 56%) up to a reported 36 for one organisation. The mean was just over 2, and only 6% had taken 6 or more students.

- Larger organisations tended to take more students, with those having 200 or more staff taking an average of more than 6 students. The vast bulk of the small organisations (those with 2-5 staff) took only one (76%) or two (12%) - 88% of them in all.

- Not all large organisations took more than one student, with 37% of the largest organisations (200+ staff) taking only one. Over half of these did take six or more.

- This suggests that, to achieve efficient placement of large numbers of students without having to deal with so many organisations, Programs should consider targeting employers with at least 20 staff.

*Active Involvement in the Program*

Table 41: Active Involvement in the Program

| ACTIVE INVOLVEMENT BY EMPLOYER IN PREPARATION FOR PROGRAM: | Year 2000 % |
|---|---|
| Selecting student before placement (n=159) | 29 |
| Planning student's activities in advance (n=127*) | 50 |

* Question added after survey commenced so base reduced

- Active involvement by the employer in preparing in advance for the Program was limited.
- Less than one third of those taking students said they had been involved in selecting the student prior to placement (29%).
- Half (50%) said that they had been involved in planning the student's activities in advance. A similar rate of employers involved in selecting students was involved in planning the students' activities in advance (54%). This suggests that involvement in selection had no effect on the level of involvement in planning the student's activities.
- Respondents with recruiting difficulties were much more likely to be involved in selecting the student (49%), and more likely to say they had been involved in planning the students' activities in advance (69%), suggesting that employers with recruitment difficulties have a more active involvement in the Program.
- Although there were marked variations by location, size of population centre, and size of business in both involvement in selection of the student and advance preparation of the student's activities, there generally was not a clear pattern in the differences. Given the small sample bases and the lack of consistent patterns, it would be unwise to further interpret these differences. A larger survey of current and lapsed participants would be needed to explore such issues and draw reliable conclusions.

*Contact with School or Coordinator*

Table 42: Contact with School or Coordinator

| Q3c RATING OF CONTACT | Year 2000 |
|---|---|
| RESPONDENTS (All Participants) | 165* |
| | % |
| Very Well | 40 |
| Quite well | 44 |
| Not too well | 2 |
| Badly | 1 |
| Unsure | 5 |
| No contact | 7 |

* Question added after survey commenced so base reduced

- Contact with the school or local coordinator went well or very well for 84% of Program participants, although 7% reported no contact, and 5% were unsure. Very few reported actual problems in the contacts (3% overall).
- Lack of contact was heavily concentrated in the Major Capital cities (around 15%), and in NSW, Queensland and WA.
- Those in the major capitals were also much less likely to rate the contacts as having gone "very well" (15%). This further investigation of the Programs in these large cities may help to identify and overcome the concerns expressed by employers.
- When all, except employers who rated contact as having gone very well, were asked how the contact could be improved, the overwhelming response was that there should be more contact and more regular contact.
- This suggests it is very important to ensure that contact is made by the school and/or local coordinator, a conclusion that is supported by further analysis of effects on satisfaction.
- Findings later show that involvement in selection of students does not appear to increase willingness to take students. It did, however, increase the proportion who rated the contact as having gone "very well" to 56% from 40% overall.

*Level of Student Preparation Prior to Placement*

Table 43: Level of Student Preparation Prior to Placement

| Q4a LEVEL OF PREPARATION OF STUDENTS | Year 2000 |
|---|---|
| RESPONDENTS | 165 |
| | % |
| All very well prepared | 21 |
| Mostly well prepared | 23 |
| Preparation just adequate | 31 |
| Not prepared well enough | 13 |
| Other comment | 8 |

* Question added after survey commenced so base reduced

- Clearly, the level of preparation of the students could have been better. Almost one in three respondents said this was just adequate (31%), and 13% said that preparation was not good enough; only 21% said all students were very well prepared.
- Further analysis must be treated with caution due to low sample bases. The following points can be taken as suggestive.
- Preparation was better in small cities and towns (29% very well prepared versus 14% in Major Capitals and Metro cities).
- Selection of students by the employer appears to have some effect on the level of preparation (24% all very well prepared versus 19% for employers not selecting students).
- Head offices were more likely to consider students had been very well prepared (42% versus 18% for sole site organisations).
- Non-members of an industry association were more likely to say students were all or mostly well prepared (60% versus 34% for members).
- Organisations experiencing recruitment difficulties appear to be more demanding on students, with only 28% rating the student as either very well or mostly well prepared, compared to 49% for respondents without recruitment difficulties.

### *Attitude to the Program By Participation In Past Year*

Table 44: Attitude to the Program By Participation In Past Year

| Q5a OVERALL ATTITUDE TO PROGRAM | Took Part Past Year | Total Sample |
|---|---|---|
| RESPONDENTS | 159 | 2098 |
| | % | % |
| A good idea for your organisation | 82 | 42 |
| A good idea but not for your organisation | 18 | 55 |
| Not a good idea at all | <1 | 3 |

- Employers who have taken part in the past year were twice as likely to acknowledge the relevance of the Program to their organisation than the total sample - 82% versus 42%.

- Whilst they might have been more convinced initially when they made the decision to take students, clearly their experience has left them extremely positive about the relevance of the Program for their organisation.

- A minority of participants (18%) had decided that the Program was not relevant to them. The reasons for this can be found in the reasons for not intending to take students next year. This is largely to do with internal changes that make it more difficult to manage students, or discovering problems with time or internal management that reduced the value of the placements in the current year. A few participants also had problems with the actual Program, such as an inappropriate student or lack of preparation for the student.

- However, the vast majority of employers are positive - indeed the rate is higher than the proportion definitely intending to continue next year.

### *Satisfaction With the Program: Recent & Lapsed Participants*

Table 45: Satisfaction With the Program: Recent & Lapsed Participants

| Q5b SATISFACTION WITH THE PROGRAM | Took Part Past Year | Took Part, Not Past Year |
|---|---|---|
| RESPONDENTS | 159 | 54 |
| | % | % |
| Very Satisfied | 34 | 28 |
| Satisfied | 50 | 45 |
| Neither | 11 | 20 |
| Dissatisfied | 1 | 5 |
| Very dissatisfied | 4 | 2 |

- 84% of all those who took part in the past year were satisfied, 34% very satisfied.

- The 73%of those who had taken previously part, but not in the past year, were satisfied - 28% very satisfied - and few were dissatisfied (7%). However the level of satisfaction was lower than those actively taking part in the current year. This suggests that to hold participants, it is not enough to avoid dissatisfaction. Producing a "very satisfied" response strongly reduces the chances of dropping out of the Program.

- Being "very satisfied" was more common for organisations with 20 or more employees (31% a among the smaller organisations, 45% for those with 20 or more). Satisfaction was even higher for single site organisations. Being satisfied was somewhat more common for non-members of industry associations (86% vs 72%).

### *Satisfaction With the Program & Intention to Participate*

Table 46: Satisfaction With the Program & Intention to Participate

| | Q5a Satisfaction With the Program | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Q4b Intend to continue to take Work placement Students | Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Neither | Dissatisfied |
| RESPONDENTS | 58 | 76 | 16 | 14 |
| | % | % | % | % |
| Yes | 80 | 64 | 80 | 13 |
| Not sure | 15 | 7 | 14 | 17 |
| No | 5 | 29 | 6 | 70 |

- 80% of those very satisfied intend to take students again (as would those who said they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied). This falls to 64% of those only satisfied. 13% of the tiny group that were actively dissatisfied would still continue to take students. While the base numbers are quite low, the pattern confirms the conclusions that to maintain involvement in the Program, it is important to keep satisfaction high if possible.

- This analysis included both recent and lapsed participants, to maximise the sample, again pointing to the value of a survey with adequate samples of these two groups.

### *Satisfaction By Selection Involvement & Activity Preparation*

Table 47: Satisfaction By Selection Involvement & Activity Preparation

| Q5b EMPLOYER SATISFACTION WITH THE PROGRAM | Involved in Student Selection | | Employer Planned Activities in Advance | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| RESPONDENTS* | 61 | 96 | 77 | 45 |
| | % | % | % | % |
| Very Satisfied | 24 | 33 | 32 | 16 |
| Satisfied | 59 | 49 | 51 | 57 |
| Neither | 14 | 11 | 15 | 15 |
| Total Dissatisfied | 2 | 6 | 2 | 12 |

* Those who took part in the past year and replied to the question

- Surprisingly, more respondents were found to be highly satisfied if they had NOT been involved in selecting the student - 33% vs 24% who were involved in selection. Although the total who were satisfied (satisfied + very satisfied) was similar (79% vs 82%).

- Twice as many respondents who were involved in planning activities in advance were highly satisfied (32% vs 16% not involved). The difference in the total who were satisfied (satisfied + very satisfied) was less marked (83% vs 73%).

- Thus, employer involvement in planning of activities in advance raised the level of satisfaction with the placement, while, at least in this sample, employer involvement in selection of the student did not.

### *Satisfaction By Quality of Contact With School or Coordinator*

Table 48: Satisfaction By Quality of Contact With School or Coordinator

| Q5b SATISFACTION WITH THE PROGRAM | How Well Contact With School/ Coordinator Went | | | No Contact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Recent Participants (n=121) | Very Well | Quite Well | Not Well + Badly | |
| RESPONDENTS | 58 | 46 | 9 | 8 |
| | % | % | % | % |
| Very Satisfied | 38 | 18 | 6 | 0 |
| Satisfied | 45 | 62 | 56 | 36 |
| Neither | 14 | 18 | 2 | 0 |
| Total Dissatisfied | 2 | 2 | 37 | 64 |

- Keeping in contact, and ensuring that contacts with the organisation go very well is clearly important for satisfaction. Although those reporting no contact, or that contact did not go well or went badly, were small (and even lower when weighted), most were actually dissatisfied, and hardly ever very satisfied.

- Ensuring the contact went very well greatly increased the proportion that was very satisfied (41% vs 25%).

- This suggests that the relationship with the school or coordinator is at least as important as the performance by the students for avoiding outright dissatisfaction (as we shall see next).

*Satisfaction By Preparation of the Students*

Table 49: Satisfaction By Preparation of the Students

| | Q4a How Well Students Were Prepared | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Q5b SATISFACTION WITH THE PROGRAM | All Very Well | Mostly Well | Just Adequate | Not Well Enough |
| RESPONDENTS | 24 | 46 | 38 | 12 |
| | % | % | % | % |
| Very Satisfied | 51 | 27 | 13 | 14 |
| Satisfied | 49 | 48 | 77 | 28 |
| Neither | 0 | 25 | 10 | 26 |
| Total Dissatisfied | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |

- Ensuring the students were very well prepared in advance had a major effect on the proportion who were very satisfied with the placement - although there were some among those who said preparation was just adequate or not good enough who remained very satisfied (13-14%).

- Dissatisfaction was, however, entirely confined to those who said the student was not well enough prepared.

- The result suggests that ensuring good preparation of students is also important for a highly satisfactory placement, and that lack of adequate preparation can produce active dissatisfaction.

*Influences on Satisfaction: A Summary*

- These analyses were limited by the size of the sample of recent participants. Thus, a larger survey specifically with recent participants (and also with lapsed participants) would provide greater confidence in the conclusions.

- Overall, it appears that active and highly satisfactory contact with the school or coordinator, preparation of the students, and employers' planning activities in advance not only avoid dissatisfaction, but boost the proportion who were very satisfied. This in turn boosts the number who intend to take part again next year, even when lapsed participants are included. This suggests that continuous contact with the employer to head off problems and maintain enthusiasm (ie. "reselling") as well as sound preparation of students and involvement of employers in advance planning of activities are essential ingredients to winning employer loyalty to the Program.

- Actual involvement in selection of the students was not important for this sample. What mattered was the continuing relationship with the school or coordinator and the level of preparation on both sides. These clearly are mutually supportive activities.

***Ways Program Could Be Improved***

Table 50: Ways Program Could Be Improved

| Q5c WAYS THE PROGRAM COULD BE IMPROVED | Taking Part, less than 'Very Satisfied' |
|---|---|
| RESPONDENTS | 136 |
| | % |
| Better planning/follow up/coordination | 16 |
| Business not suitable for training/limited what we can teach | 13 |
| Prepare students in school about working | 11 |
| Select interested/motivated students | 10 |
| Select suitable students/better screening | 10 |
| Good as it is/satisfied | 7 |
| Pay issues | 6 |
| Time issues (when students work, etc) | 5 |
| Others each | <5 |
| Don't know/None | 20 |

- Those who rated themselves as satisfied or less were asked about the ways that the Program could be improved, and some issues with the current Program were revealed.

- A substantial group (27%) said they were happy with it as it was (7%) or gave no specific reply (20%), suggesting that there were no concrete issues they wished to raise.

- The other more common replies focus on suitability of the students in terms of skill, readiness to fit into a work place, motivation, and on better planning and coordination. A specific suggestion in this area was that employers be provided with more information about the student's background.

- Some (13%) suggested that their businesses were not suitable for a learning Program. These were nearly all from organisations with fewer than 20 employees, and mostly in Primary Industry (77%).

- Smaller organisations raised issues relating to the total time students work, the timing of work periods, and about payment, mostly in the Primary Industry, Hospitality & Tourism or Transport & Storage industries.

- A large proportion of the comments and suggestions came from those who were unable or unwilling to give a definite rating, and classified themselves as neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

***Sample Characteristics***

This section describes the characteristics of the total sample (unweighted and weighted) and compares these with the participants.

*Population Centre Type, State/Territory & Size*

Table 51: Population Centre Type, State/Territory & Size

| | 2000 SURVEY | | | | 1998 SURVEY | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | TOTAL SAMPLE | | RECENT PARTICIPANT | | TOTAL SAMPLE | |
| | N | WTD % | N | WTD % | N | WTD % |
| **Total** | 2098 | 2098 | 159 | 111 | 1507 | 1507 |
| **Centre Type** | | | | | | |
| Major Capital | 832 | 61.0 | 46 | 43 | NA | NA |
| Metro | 424 | 14.0 | 33 | 9 | NA | NA |
| Urban | 621 | 18.5 | 59 | 37 | NA | NA |
| Rural | 221 | 6.5 | 21 | 11 | NA | NA |
| **State/Territory** | | | | | | |
| NSW | 592 | 33.5 | 37 | 13 | 302 | 33 |
| Vic | 444 | 24.5 | 23 | 28 | 251 | 27 |
| Qld | 402 | 19.7 | 37 | 34 | 226 | 18 |
| SA | 178 | 7.7 | 18 | 10 | 190 | 7 |
| WA | 201 | 9.9 | 17 | 8 | 191 | 10 |
| Tas | 126 | 2.2 | 14 | 2 | 146 | 3 |
| NT | 60 | 1.3 | 5 | 3 | 101 | 1 |
| ACT | 95 | 1.2 | 8 | 2 | 100 | 1 |
| **Number of Employees (National)** | | | | | | |
| 2 to 5 | 755 | 64.8 | 40 | 52 | 1153 | 80 |
| 6 to 19 | 610 | 28.0 | 49 | 37 | | |
| 20 to 99 | 387 | 6.0 | 39 | 8 | 202 | 13 |
| 100 to 199 | 123 | 0.7 | 11 | 1 | | |
| 200+ | 223 | 0.5 | 20 | 1 | 152 | 7 |

- The sample was stratified by Population Centre Type, State/Territory, the Size (defined as the number of employees in Australia) and Industry.

- Some strata were deliberately over-sampled, eg businesses in metros, population over 100,000 and urban cities and towns, less than 1000. Businesses outside major capitals and metros were screened to achieve a minimum of 200 respondents from small towns. This also resulted in 621 from larger towns (populations 1000 to under 100,000).

- Weighting for the centre type was based on the proportion of the general population to achieve a target distribution, as the breakdown of businesses' numbers was not available. For the split between Urban and Rural the weighting was taken as the same ratio as that obtained in the sample, as this appeared a better guide than relative population numbers. For the other weighting variables, the target distributions were based on ABS statistics. The weighting ensures that, for example, the substantial number of larger businesses in the sample does not disproportionately influence the total population estimates. Nor does it distort results when looking at the large businesses, or in any other stratum.

### *Industry*

Table 52: Industry

| | 2000 Survey | | 2000 Survey | | 1998 Survey | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | TOTAL SAMPLE | | Participant Last Year | | TOTAL SAMPLE | |
| | N | WTD % | N | WTD N | N | WTD % |
| Total | 2098 | 100 | 159 | 111 | 1507 | 100 |
| **Industry** | | | | | | |
| Primary Ind. & Mining | 140 | 21.8 | 10 | 25.2 | 182 | 10.0 |
| Manufacturing | 233 | 7.0 | 16 | 8 | 84 | 6.0 |
| Utilities & Communications | 51 | 0.1 | 5 | 0.2 | 175 | 0.1 |
| Construction & Building | 230 | 9.3 | 19 | 9.3 | 88 | 11.0 |
| Wholesale | 114 | 6.2 | 7 | 6.5 | 91 | 7.0 |
| Retail | 338 | 13.7 | 23 | 8.5 | 105 | 16.0 |
| Hospitality & Tourism | 278 | 4.6 | 32 | 7.8 | 88 | 4.0 |
| Transport & Storage | 79 | 3.7 | 4 | 1.3 | 100 | 5.0 |
| Finance & Insurance | 85 | 1.9 | 2 | 0.5 | 95 | 4.0 |
| Property & Bus Serv's | 245 | 17.0 | 17 | 23.8 | 90 | 17.0 |
| Gov'ment, Education, Health & Community Services | 177 | 10.3 | 14 | 4.5 | 235 | 12.0 |
| Cultural & Personal Services | 128 | 4.4 | 10 | 4.2 | 174 | 7.0 |

- Some ANZSIC industry groups were combined for the purposes of controlling the sample and weighting. Those in Mining (30 interviews) were combined with Primary Industry, Government, Health Services, Education and Community Services were also combined, as were Cultural Services and Personal & Other Services.

- The targets for number of interviews were revised progressively in the light of the actual numbers achieved, without any effect on the overall findings.

- The sample was obtained from CD ROMs containing all business telephone numbers - effectively, the national Yellow Pages. To achieve the over sample of larger businesses, businesses known to have 20-99, 100-199, or 200+ employees were targeted in drawing the samples.

- To achieve acceptable base numbers in some industries and for the larger businesses additional sample was purchased from a commercial list provider. To ensure a better spread by State and Territory, the sample was targeted against combinations of size, industry and State/Territory. In many cases, every known business in that combination was included, and many of these had already been called from the existing sample.

- Some industries (especially Hospitality) were undersampled in Sydney and Melbourne where interviewing commenced, as other industries were more readily obtained in these locations. Thus while the sample matches population estimates for industry overall, it does not exactly do so within each State or within each size range.

***Job Titles of Respondents***

Table 53: Respondent Job Titles

| RESPONDENT'S JOB TITLE | TOTAL SAMPLE | TOOK PART PAST YEAR |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| CEO/Owner/Partner/Managing Director | 40 | 33 |
| Senior manager (General Manager/Director) | 22 | 24 |
| Middle Management | 4 | 7 |
| Departmental Manager | 1 | 1 |
| Manager/Assistant Manager/Supervisor | 11 | 11 |
| Human Resources Manager | 5 | 3 |
| Office Administrator/Accountant | 6 | 9 |
| Coordinator | 1 | 2 |
| Clerical/Receptionist/Secretary | 3 | 8 |
| Foreman/Tradesman etc | 1 | 0 |
| Principal/Deputy Principal/Vice Chancellor | 1 | 1 |

- Most respondents held management responsibility at some level. In smaller companies the owner or senior manager, in larger companies HR or Manager, were interviewed.

***Heard of ASTF?***

Table 55: Heard of Australian Student Traineeship Foundation (ASTF)

| Q14 Heard of ASTF | TOTAL SAMPLE | Took Part in Past Year | Member of Ind. Association |
|---|---|---|---|
| RESPONDENTS | 2098 | 159 | 1277 |
| | % | % | % |
| Yes | 11 | 27 | 14 |
| No | 86 | 69 | 84 |
| Unsure | 3 | 4 | 2 |

- When the survey was carried out (November/December 2000), and throughout the period of activity covered by the survey, ECEF was known by its previous name, the Australian Student Traineeship Foundation, or ASTF.

- ASTF was known to only 11% of the total sample, and to only 20% of organisations aware of the SWL Program.

- Those taking part in the past 12 months were almost 3 times more likely to have heard of the ASTF. However, those who had were still a minority (27%) of this group.

- Those who were members of industry associations were only a little more likely to have heard of the ASTF (14% vs 11%).

- Tasmania (22%) and ACT (25%) had the highest awareness of the ASTF, with NSW and Victoria lowest (both 10%).

# APPENDIX A

## The Questionnaire

Structured Workplace Learning
Employer Participation Project

Job No: 1899
AMR Interactive

Final Questionnaire

Introduction: "Hello, could I please speak to the person responsible for staff recruitment."

LOCATION (AUTOMATICALLY RECORDED)

Major Capital Cities (Codes 1-5)
C1 Sydney
C2 Melbourne
C3 Brisbane
C4 Adelaide
C5 Perth
Metropolitan (Other Cities, Population 100,000+, Codes 6-10)
C6 NSW Metro (Newcastle, Wollongong)
C7 Canberra
C8 Queensland Metro (Gold Coast, Sunshine Coast, Townsville, Cairns)
C9 Metro Tasmania (Hobart, Launceston)
C10 Metro Victoria (Geelong)
Urban (Other Towns, 1000 to under 100,000, codes 11-17)
C11 Other Urban NSW
C12 Other Urban Victoria
C13 Other Urban Queensland
C14 Other Urban SA
C15 Other Urban WA
C16 Other Urban Tasmania
C17 Urban NT
Rural (Under 1000, outside town, Codes 18-24)
C18 Rural NSW
C19 Rural Victoria
C20 Rural Queensland
C21 Rural SA
C22 Rural WA
C23 Rural Tasmania
C24 Rural NT

On reaching the appropriate person confirm their role as per above.

Explanation: "Good morning/afternoon/evening my name is "...." from AMR Interactive, a market research firm calling on behalf of a National organisation involved in placing school students with employers. We are conducting research into recruitment and training on behalf of employers and industry. "

S1. SCREEN FOR MORE THAN 1 EMPLOYEE
Can I just check this is a business which employs more than one person?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| C1 | Yes | Continue |
| C2 | No | Thank and end |

S2. WHETHER READY TO START
Would you have time to answer some questions?

IF ASKED HOW LONG WILL THE INTERVIEW TAKE RESPOND
No more than 15 minutes. (If need encouragement add: "Your feedback will help determine how best to develop students for businesses like yours when they need to recruit young staff.")

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| C1 | Yes | GO TO S4 |
| C2 | No | CONTINUE |

IF NO TO S2 ASK:
S3. MAKE APPOINTMENT
Would another time be appropriate?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| C1 | Yes | MAKE APPOINTMENT |
| C2 | No | THANK AND END |

S4. INDUSTRY
Firstly I would like to ask a few questions about your business.

What is the main activity of your organisation – the main thing it does? (RECORD VERBATIM)

CHECK QUOTAS
IF LOCATION CODE 1-10 - MAJOR CAPITAL/METRO - GO TO B1
S5 URBAN/RURAL
Is your business located inside the boundary of a city or town with 1000 or more people?

1 Urban (inside town 1000+ population)
2 Rural (NOT inside town 1000+ population)

### B1 TITLE
And your title is? (CODE FRAME FROM PREVIOUS SURVEY TO BE USED)
IF MANAGER PROBE "Do you manage Human Resources?" If yes, record as HR Manager.

### B2 NUMBER OF BRANCHES
How many offices or branches does your organisation have?

RECORD NUMBER

IF MORE THAN 1 MENTIONED IN B2 ASK B3. OTHERS GO TO B4.

### B3 HEAD OFFICE
Is this the Australian Head Office or is it a branch?

| | |
|---|---|
| C1 | Head Office |
| C2 | Branch |
| C3 | Other (specify) |

### B4 EMPLOYEES AT SITE
And on the site that you are employed at, how many employees are located there?

RECORD NUMBER (If required explain that this is full time equivalents)

IF MORE THAN 1 MENTIONED IN B2 ASK B5. OTHERS GO TO B6

### B5 EMPLOYEES IN AUSTRALIA
And approximately how many employees do you have in your organisation in Australia?

If unsure – Can you please estimate whether the number of employees for your whole company is:

| | |
|---|---|
| C1 | 1 only (thank and terminate) |
| C1 | 2-5 |
| C2 | 6-19 |
| C3 | 20-99 |
| C4 | 100-199 |
| C5 | 200 and + |
| C6 | Unsure |

### B6 RECRUITING DIFFICULTIES
Are you having any difficulty in recruiting good, young staff who want to stay with you?

| | |
|---|---|
| C1 | Yes |
| C2 | No |
| C3 | Unsure |

**Awareness and Role in Program**

Q1a. AWARENESS OF SWL PROGRAMS
I would like to talk to you about your knowledge of Structured Workplace Programs currently operating in your area for senior school students. **These Are Not Work Experience Programs** but structured Programs aimed at developing skills in the workplace."

> FURTHER EXPLANATORY NOTES IF CLARIFICATION NEEDED.
>
> "Work experience is where a student attends a workplace simply to gain exposure to the world of work. It does not form part of an accredited vocational course of study for the student."
>
> "Structured placements are part of an industry recognised training Program within a Yr 11/12 course which give students some credit towards their (Insert appropriate abbreviation NSW = HSC, Vic = VCE, WA = WACE, SA = SACE, Tas = TCE, ACT = Year 12 Certificate, NT = Northern Territory, Qld = Senior Certificate) study and are specifically aimed at students developing accredited skills and competencies in a specific industry."
>
> > For example: a student undertaking vocational studies in retail might work with a department store to develop competencies in customer servicing. Another student undertaking a building and construction course might work in a fit out firm to develop competencies in building materials.
> >
> > Other examples include: office skills, hospitality, automotive, engineering and information technology.

Had you ever heard of the provision of structured work placement Programs before I described them to you just now?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| C1 | Yes – without reading additional information<br>Continue | |
| C2 | Yes – after reading additional information<br>Continue | |
| C3 | No | Go to Q5a |
| C4 | Not sure | Refer to further explanatory notes above and clarify. If still unsure code as 4 and go to Q5a |

Q1b. HOW BECAME AWARE
How did you first become aware? (DO NOT PROMPT)

C1 Approach by school/coordinator (CODE BLOCKED)
C2 By industry organisation (CODE BLOCKED)
C3 By student
C4 ASTF activities
C5 Someone within the company
C6 Another business
C7 Other (SPECIFY)
C8 Unsure

C13 School
C14 Local coordinator
C15 Local Chamber of Commerce
C16 National ACCI
C17 Own industry assoc.
C18 Australian Industry Group
C19 Australian Business
C20 Group Training Company
C21 Other training co/org (specify)

Q2a. EVER TAKEN PART
So has your organisation been involved in the provision of structured work placements to the best of your knowledge?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| C1 | Yes | Go to Q2b |
| C2 | No | Go to Q2ax |
| C3 | Maybe/ not sure | Go to Q2ai |

Q2ax EVER INVOLVED IN OTHER WORK EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS
Have you been involved in any other sort of work experience Program?

| | |
|---|---|
| C1 | Yes |
| C2 | No |
| C3 | Maybe/ not sure |

Q2ai. EVER CONSIDERED TAKING PART
Has your organisation ever considered providing work placements to the best of your knowledge?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| C1 | Yes | Go to Q2aii |
| C2 | No | Go to Q5a |
| C3 | Maybe/ not sure | Go to Q5a |

Q2aii. REASON DID NOT TAKE PART
Why did you not go ahead with it? **(Unprompted) (Multiple responses possible)**
PROBE Any others?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| C1 | Did not know who to contact | Go to Q5a |
| C2 | Poor experience with School Coordinator/representative | Go to Q5a |
| C3 | Too busy to take on students | Go to Q5a |
| C4 | Did not get around to it | Go to Q5a |
| C5 | Not enough benefit for business | Go to Q5a |
| C6 | Concerned too disruptive | Go to Q5a |
| C7 | Have no one able to supervise/manage students | Go to Q5a |
| C8 | Other (specify) | Go to Q5a |
| C9 | Unsure | Go to Q5a |

Q2b TAKEN PART LAST 12 MONTHS
Has your organisation been involved in the provision of structured work placements to the best of your knowledge in the past 12 months?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| C1 | Yes | CONTINUE |
| C2 | No | Go to Q2d |
| C3 | Maybe/ not sure | Go to Q5a |

Q2c. NUMBER OF STUDENTS TAKEN

So, approximately how many year 11/12 students would your organisation have taken on structured work placements over the past 12 months?

Write in ____________________

Don't know99

Q2d. WHETHER PREVIOUSLY TAKEN SWL STUDENTS

Has your organisation taken students on structured work placements in previous years?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 1 |
| No | 2 |
| Maybe/Unsure | 3 |

IF NOT CODE 2 @ Q2b GO TO Q3a (IE DID NOT TAKE STUDENTS IN PAST 12 MONTHS)

Q2e REASON FOR NOT TAKING STUDENT IN 2000

Why did you not take students this year? (UNPROMPTED)

| | |
|---|---|
| Did not know who to contact | 1 |
| Poor experience with School Coordinator/representative | 2 |
| Too busy to take on students | 3 |
| Did not get around to it | 4 |
| Not enough benefit for business | 5 |
| Concerned too disruptive | 6 |
| Have no one able to supervise/manage students | 7 |
| There were no good students | 8 |
| No one contacted me | 9 |
| Other (specify) | 10 |
| Unsure | 11 |

Q3a. INVOLVEMENT IN SELECTION OF STUDENTS

Were you or anyone in the organisation personally involved in selecting students prior to their placements?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 1 |
| No | 2 |
| Unsure (Don't Read) | 3 |

### Q3b. PLANNING OF ACTIVITIES IN ADVANCE

Were the tasks the student(s) undertook planned in advance with a school representative or coordinator?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 1 |
| No | 2 |
| Unsure (Don't Read) | 3 |

### Q3c. RATING OF CONTACT WITH COORDINATOR/SCHOOL

How well did your contacts with the school representative/coordinator work out? Would you say; READ OUT

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Very well | 1 | Go to Q4a |
| Quite well | 2 | Continue |
| Not too well | 3 | Continue |
| Badly | 4 | Continue |
| Unsure (Don't Read) | 5 | Continue |
| No contact | 6 | Go to Q4a |

### Q3d. HOW TO IMPROVE PROGRAM

How could that have been better? (RECORD VERBATIM)

### Q4a. HOW WELL STUDENTS WERE PREPARED

Overall, how well prepared would you say the students were prior to them starting their placements? Would you say; READ OUT

| | |
|---|---|
| All very well prepared | 1 |
| Mostly well prepared | 2 |
| Preparation just adequate | 3 |
| Not prepared well enough | 4 |
| Other (specify) | 5 |
| Unsure (Don't Read) | 6 |

### Q4b. PLAN TO CONTINUE TAKING SWL STUDENTS

Do you plan to continue to take structured workplace students?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 1 | Go to Q5a |
| No | 2 | Continue |
| Maybe/Unsure | 3 | Continue |

Q4c. REASON WILL NOT CONTINUE
Why is that? **(Unprompted Multiple responses possible)**

| | |
|---|---|
| Bad experience this year | 1 |
| Was not able to use student effectively / waste of time and effort | 2 |
| Changed circumstances / won't be able to (use properly / supervise / etc) | 3 |
| Other (specify) | 7 |
| Managerial decision (don't know reason) | 8 |
| Unsure | 9 |

**Attitudes, Opinions and Barriers**

Q5a. **Read out the appropriate introduction.**

IF CODE 1 OR 2 @ Q1a AND CODE 1 @ Q2a - IE AWARE AND PARTICIPATING ASK

"Given your knowledge and experience of the provision of structured work placements could you please tell me whether you believe this type of Program is a good idea for your organisation, a good idea but not for your organisation, or not a good idea at all."

IF CODE 1 OR 2 @ Q1a AND NOT CODE 1 @ Q2a - IE AWARE AND NOT PARTICIPATING ASK

"Given your knowledge of the Program could you please tell me whether you believe this type of Program is a good idea for your organisation, a good idea but not for your organisation, or not a good idea at all."

IF NOT CODE 1 OR 2 @ Q1a - IE NOT AWARE

(Repeat explanation if necessary and expand)

"Thinking of the provision of structured work placements I've just described could you please tell me whether you believe this type of Program is a good idea for your organisation, a good idea but not for your organisation, or not a good idea at all."

| | |
|---|---|
| A good idea for your organisation | 1 |
| A good idea but not for your organisation | 2 |
| Not a good idea at all | 3 |

IF NOT CODE 1 @ Q2a (IE IF NOT PARTICIPATING) GO TO Q5d

Q5b. SATISFACTION

Overall, how satisfied has your company been with the provision of structured work placements so far. Would you say your company has been very satisfied, satisfied, neither satisfied or dissatisfied, dissatisfied or very dissatisfied?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Very satisfied | 1 | Go to 5d |
| Satisfied | 2 | Continue |
| Neither | 3 | Continue |
| Dissatisfied | 4 | Continue |
| Very dissatisfied | 5 | Continue |

ASK ONLY IF CODES 2/5 @ Q5b

Q5c. HOW COULD IMPROVE

How could it be improved? (RECORD VERBATIM)

IF NOT CODES 1 OR 2 @ Q1a (IE IF NOT AWARE) GO TO Q6a

Q5d. WHETHER RECOMMEND PARTICIPATION

Would you recommend taking part in this Program to other organisations? Would you say ....

(READ CODES 1-3)

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes – have already done so | 1 |
| Yes – willing to do so | 2 |
| Would not do so | 3 |
| Unsure / It depends | 4 |

Q6a. **Ask all with appropriate introduction**
IF CODES 1 OR 2 IN Q1a AND CODE 1 IN Q2a - AWARE AND PARTICIPATING - ASK:
"Given your knowledge and experience of the provision of work placements could you please tell me whether you believe your company is receiving a great deal of benefit, some benefit or not much benefit at all in each of the following areas...."

**For those who are aware of the provision of work placements Programs and not participating (Code 1 or 2 in Q1a & Not Code 1 in Q2a)**
IF CODES 1 OR 2 IN Q1a AND NOT CODE 1 IN Q2a - AWARE AND NOT PARTICIPATING - ASK:
"Given your knowledge of the provision of structured work placements could you please tell me whether you believe your company would receive a great deal of benefit, some benefit or not much benefit at all in each of the following areas..."

**For those who are not aware of the Program (Not Codes 1 or 2 in Q1a)**
IF NOT CODES 1 AND 2 IN Q1a - NOT AWARE - ASK:

(Repeat explanation if necessary and expand)

"Thinking of the type of Program I've just described could you please tell me whether you believe your company would receive a great deal of benefit, some benefit or not much benefit at all in each of the following areas....."

RANDOMISE ASKING ORDER OF AREAS

| | A great deal of benefit | Some benefit | Not much benefit at all |
|---|---|---|---|
| Increasing productivity | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Enhancing the company's skill base | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| More efficient & effective recruitment | 1 | 2 | 3. |
| Community recognition | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Personal satisfaction of staff | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Improving the bottom line/profitability/financial benefit | 1 | 2 | 3 |

Q6b. DETAIL OF BENEFITS

You mentioned you thought there were (possibly) some benefits for the organisation in (insert all areas where there were at least some benefits). What do you see as the main benefits in this area? **(Do not prompt) (Repeat for all areas)** ***Please tick***

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Productivity** | **Enhancing the company's skill base** | **More efficient & effective recruitment** |
| Staff are freed to do other Work | Training provided to company staff | Better fit/try before buy |
| Students contribute to the business (do useful work) | Staff re-think their own jobs in order to train students | Reduces costs of recruitment<br>- Advertising<br>- Agency costs<br>- Lower turnover of new recruits |
| Students contribute to the business (have new ideas) | A change to a learning organisation | Improve industry pool as a whole |
| Other (specify) | Increases or improves assessments of employee performance | Encourages more high calibre recruits |
| | Better team work habits by staff | Other (specify) |
| | Other (specify) | |
| **Community Recognition** | **Personal Satisfaction of Staff** | |
| Providing a community service | Staff feel good about giving knowledge | |
| Customer goodwill/loyalty | Staff feel good about extra responsibility | |
| Contribute to development of local education | General improvement in Morale | |
| Additional customers buy from us | Other (specify) | |
| Customers inclined to buy more from Us | | |
| Other (specify) | | |

ASK ALL

Q6c. BOTTOM LINE BENEFITS

Thinking about the benefits we have just discussed, in what way, if any, could your business gain bottom line benefits from participation in the Program? (DO NOT READ OUT)

| | |
|---|---|
| No bottom line benefits | 1 |
| Less cost to get work done | 2 |
| Do useful work | 3 |
| Increased productivity | 4 |
| Increased sales | 5 |

Q7. OPINIONS ABOUT WORKPLACE PROGRAMS

IF CODES 1 OR 2 @ Q1a AND CODE 1 @ Q2a - AWARE & PARTICIPATING - ASK:
Thinking about the provision of work placements and its suitability to your organisation, could you please tell me whether you strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree or strongly disagree with each of the following statements.

IF CODES 1 OR 2 @ Q1a AND NOT CODE 1 @ Q2a - AWARE & NOT PARTICIPATING - ASK:
Thinking about the provision of structured work placements and its possible suitability to your organisation, could you please tell me whether you strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree or strongly disagree with each of the following statements.

IF NOT CODES 1 OR 2 @ Q1a - NOT AWARE - ASK:
Thinking about the provision of work placements as I have described them to you (ASK IF REQUIRE FURTHER CLARIFICATION) I would like to get your thoughts and ideas about how these Programs would be suitable or otherwise for your organisation. Could you please tell me whether you strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree or strongly disagree with each of the following statements.

RANDOMISE ASKING ORDER

| **Attitude** | SA | A | N | D | SD |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| This type of Program would take too much staff time | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| The students on this type of Program aren't the type we are looking for | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| My company would be willing to contribute to the direct cost of coordinating the placement of students | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| I would like to see my company take more students on this type of Program | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| ASK ONLY IF PARTICIPATING - CODE 1 @ Q2a There does not seem to be a good assessment process to ensure that the kids got out of it what was expected | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

**Needs**

Q8. IMPORTANCE OF BENEFITS

Thinking of what your organisation values in terms of these types of provision of structured workplacements how important is it that any Program delivers benefits in each of the following areas, would you say it is very important, moderately important or slightly important or not at all important that the Program delivers benefits in the area of ….?

RANDOMISE ASKING ORDER

| | Very important | Moderately important | Slightly important | Not at all important |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Improving Productivity | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Enhancing the company's skill base | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| More efficient & effective recruitment | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Community recognition | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Personal satisfaction of staff | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Improving the bottom line/profitability/financial benefit | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

**Role of Industry Association and Communication**

IF NOT CODES 1 AND 2 @ Q1a - IE IF NOT AWARE - GO TO Q11a

Q9. WHO CONTACTED RESPONDENT

To the best of your knowledge, who if anyone has contacted your company to invite it to take part in the Program? DO NOT READ OUT. PROBE: Anyone else?

| | |
|---|---|
| Industry association | 1 |
| Coordinator | 2 |
| School staff | 3 |
| Other (specify) | 4 |
| No-one | 5 |
| Don't know if contacted | 6 |

Q10.WORD OF MOUTH (MULTIPLE REPLIES ALLOWED)

Have you heard anything favourable or unfavourable about the Program from other sources?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes – heard favourable | 1 |
| Yes – heard unfavourable | 2 |
| Not heard anything | 3 |
| Other (specify) | 4 |
| Unsure (Exclusive) | 5 |

IF CODE 1 @ Q2b - CURRENT PARTICIPANT - GO TO Q11b

Q11a.POSSIBLE SOURCES OF INFORMATION

If you were considering whether to take students on Structured Workplace Training, who, if anyone might you contact for advice and assistance? (DO NOT PROMPT MULTIPLE RESPONSES)

PROMPT Anywhere else?

PROBE: IF 'A TRAINING COMPANY' IS MENTIONED, ASK

'What is the name of the company?"

| | |
|---|---|
| C1 | I would not consider taking on students |
| C2 | I would not seek advice |
| C3 | School |
| C4 | Local coordinator |
| C5 | Local Chamber of Commerce |
| C6 | National ACCI |
| C7 | Own industry association |
| C8 | Australian Industry Group (AIG) |
| C9 | Australian Business |
| C10 | Group Training Company |
| C11 | Other training company / organisation (specify) |
| C12 | ASTF |
| C13 | Other (specify) |
| C14 | Unsure |

IF NOT CODE 1 @ Q2a - IE IF NOT PARTICIPATING - GO TO Q12a
Q11b.ACTUAL SOURCE OF INFORMATION
Where, if anywhere, did you seek advice and assistance from when first considering to take students on the Structured Workplace Training Program? DO NOT PROMPT MULTIPLE RESPONSES POSSIBLE PROMPT Anywhere else?
PROBE: IF 'A TRAINING COMPANY' IS MENTIONED, ASK
'What is the name of the company?"

| | |
|---|---|
| Did not seek advice | 2 |
| School | 3 |
| Local coordinator | 4 |
| Local Chamber of Commerce | 5 |
| National ACCI | 6 |
| Own industry association | 7 |
| Australian Industry Group (AIG) | 8 |
| Australian Business | 9 |
| Group Training Company | 10 |
| Other training company / organisation (specify) | 11 |
| ASTF | 12 |
| Other (specify) | 13 |
| Unsure | 14 |

IF NOT CODES 3-13 @ Q11b - NO ORGANISATION MENTIONED - GO TO Q12a
Q11ci WHETHER ADVICE AND ASSISTANCE HELPFUL
Did you find that advice and assistance helpful?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 1 |
| No | 2 |
| Unsure | 3 |

IF MORE THAN ONE OF CODES 3-13 @ Q11b ASK Q11cii. OTHERS GO TO Q12a
Q11ciiMOST HELPFUL SOURCE
Which if any (REFER Q11b) of those did you find the MOST helpful? **(Unprompted)**

| | |
|---|---|
| Did not seek advice | 2 |
| School | 3 |
| Local coordinator | 4 |
| Local Chamber of Commerce | 5 |
| National ACCI | 6 |
| Own industry association | 7 |
| Australian Industry Group (AIG) | 8 |
| Australian Business | 9 |
| Group Training Company | 10 |
| Other training company / organisation (specify) | 11 |
| ASTF | 12 |
| Other (specify) | 13 |
| Unsure | 14 |

ASK ALL
Q12aINDUSTRY ORGANISATION - WHETHER MEMBER
Is your business a member of an industry organisation?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 1 |
| No | 2 |
| Unsure | 3 |

IF CODES 2-3 @ Q12a GO TO Q13
Q12bINDUSTRY ORGANISATION(S)
Which ones? DO NOT PROMPT

| | |
|---|---|
| Local Chamber of Commerce | 1 |
| National ACCI | 2 |
| Own industry association | 3 |
| Australian Industry Group (AIG) | 4 |
| Australian Business | 5 |
| Other (specify) | 6 |
| Unsure | 7 |

IF CODE 1 @ Q2a GO TO Q14
Q13ENCOURAGE PARTICIPATION
IF FIRST ITEM ASK
Would INSERT FIRST ITEM make you very likely, likely, unlikely or very unlikely to make you take students for work placements next year?

FOR SUBSEQUENT ITEMS ASK
How about INSERT ITEM?
(RANDOMISE ITEM ASKING ORDER)

| | Very Likely | Likely | Unlikely | Very Unlikely | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A personal recommendation from someone else in your industry | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Formal recommendation from your industry association eg Chamber of Commerce | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Testimonials from students who've been involved in the Program | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Suggestion or recommendation from your senior management (if applicable) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Training for your staff to supervise work placements | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Endorsement by a large employer in your industry | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Publicity by local schools of your role in the provision of work placements | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Personal approach by local school or coordinator, discussing your needs and the opportunities for taking students | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Contact by a national organisation co-ordinating the support for placing students with businesses | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Q14. AWARENESS OF ASTF - PROMPTED
The national organisation that co-ordinates the Student Workplace Training Program is the ASTF - the Australian Student Traineeship Foundation. Have you heard of it before today?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 1 |
| No | 2 |
| Unsure | 3 |

### Q15a. WILLINGNESS TO HAVE CONTACT PASSED TO ASTF

Would you be willing to have your contact details and responses forwarded to ASTF so that you could be contacted in the future?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 1 |
| No | 2 |
| Unsure | 3 |

If yes record; name, title, address, suburb/town, state, postcode and phone number.

### Q15b. WILLINGNESS TO RECEIVE ASTF NEWSLETTER

Would you be willing for ASTF to send you it's newsletter? (Explanation if required 'It is called Networker and it is mailed out 3 times a year)

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 1 |
| No | 2 |
| Unsure | 3 |

If yes record; name, title, address, suburb/town, state, postcode and phone number. (Do not repeat if already recorded in Q15a)

STANDARD "THANK YOU" & CLOSE

CE083946 0

**U.S. Department of Education**
*Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)*
*National Library of Education (NLE)*
*Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)*

ERIC
Educational Resources Information Center

# REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

## I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Employer Perspective

Author(s):

Corporate Source: Enterprise & Career Education Foundation

Publication Date: 2000

## II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents | The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents | The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents |
| PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY<br>Sample<br>TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)<br>1 | PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY<br>Sample<br>TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)<br>2A | PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY<br>Sample<br>TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)<br>2B |
| Level 1<br>↑<br>☑ | Level 2A<br>↑<br>☐ | Level 2B<br>↑<br>☐ |
| Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy. | Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only | Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only |

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

*I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.*

**Sign here, → please**

Signature:
Printed Name/Position/Title: DIRECTOR
Organization/Address: P.O. Box 4986, Sydney 2001
Telephone: 612 8223 5826
FAX:
E-Mail Address:
Date: 6/9/02

*(Over)*

## III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

| |
|---|
| Publisher/Distributor: |
| Address: |
| Price: |

## IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

| |
|---|
| Name: |
| Address: |

## V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

**Acquisitions Coordinator**
**ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education**
**Center on Education and Training for Employment**
**1900 Kenny Road**
**Columbus, OH 43210-1090**

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

**ERIC Processing and Reference Facility**
**4483-A Forbes Boulevard**
**Lanham, Maryland 20706**

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: info@ericfac.piccard.csc.com
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)